DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 413 254 SO 026 914

AUTHOR	Willis, Wayne, Ed.
TITLE	Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Southwest Society of Philosophy and History Education (44th, September 23-25, 1993, New Orleans, Louisiana).
INSTITUTION	Society of Philosophy and History of Education.
PUB DATE	1994-00-00
NOTE	187p.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Proceedings (021) -- Collected Works - Serials (022) -- Reports - Research (143)
JOURNAL CIT	Journal of Educational Philosophy and History; v44 1993
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Comparative Education; *Educational Anthropology; *Educational History; *Educational Philosophy; Educational Principles; *Educational Theories; *Foundations of Education; Higher Education; Philosophy

ABSTRACT

This annual publication offers a collection of papers, essays, and speeches related to the history and philosophy of education. This volume contains: (1) "The Presidential Address: The Educational Revolution in Kentucky, or How To Build the Plane After You're Off the Ground" (Wayne Willis); (2) "The Seventh Annual William E. Drake Lecture: Was Bill Drake a Religious Person?" (William H. Fisher); (3) "Inferences from Studies about the Contradictory Role of Adult Education in the University" (Henry R. Weinstock); (4) "Critical Pedagogy, Liberalism, and Dewey" (David Snelgrove); (5) "The Privatization of Schools and the General Welfare" (Richard J. Elliott; Carol S. Stack); (6) "Character Education, Values Education, Equity Education and Politics: A Challenge to American Educators" (Fred D. Kierstead); (7) "The Junkyard Dog" (Stanley D. Ivie); (8) "The Dead Dog" (Stanley D. Ivie); (9) "Reconstruction and Deconstruction: Implications of Contemporary Critical Theory for Qualitative Research Techniques" (James D. Swartz); (10) "Derrida, Deconstruction, and Education Policy Analysis" (Charles J. Fazzaro); (11) "Reform and Reconstruction in Education: Commitment or Fad" (James Van Patten; James Bolding); (12) "Mind, Character, and the Deferral of Gratification; An Rx for Educational Change" (Louis Goldman); (13) "Pragmatic Conceptions of Community" (Sam Stack); (14) "International Partnerships in Education" (Margaret Clark; Annette Digby); (15) "A Study of the Degree of Progressivism among Arkansas Public School Superintendents: Implications for Educational Reform" (Ann E. Witcher); (16) "Education Philanthropist George Peabody (1795-1869), George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, and the Peabody Library and Conservatory of Music, Baltimore: A Brief History" (Franklin Parker; Betty J. Parker); (17) "It's All in the Way We Look At Things - Is It?" (Cornell Thomas); (18) "Men's Roles in Women's Studies: A Case in Point" (Joe L. Green); (19) "Somewhat Less than Perfect: Carl Schurz's Policies and the Indian Schools" (Karen McKellips); (20) "The Biography of a Radical Chinese Feminist and Revolutionary (1875-1907)" (Timothy J. Bergen, Jr.); (21) "New Theoretical Perspectives on Educational Organizations" (Spencer J. Maxcy); (22) "Images of African-American Teachers in the American South: A Colonized People, Carriers of the New Slavery, or Human Agents" (Clinton B. Allison); (23) "Paulo Freire's Influence on the Community of Faith, Through Religious Education" (John M. Townsend); (24) "The Educational Philosophy of Mao Zedong

+++++ ED413254 Has Multi-page SFR---Level=1 +++++
from 1949 to 1976" (Hanfu Mi); (25) "Major Paradigms for Educational Reform in Oregon" (Bill Cowart); (26) "The Hedge Schools and Education in the American South" (Karl J. Jost); (27) "Influences that Shaped Susan Blow's Involvement in Kindergarten Education" (Paul D. Travers); (28) "Kenneth D. Benne in Retrospect" (William H. Fisher); (29) "Effective Education for African American Students: A Cultural Model" (Barley L. McSwine); (30) "Thomas Jefferson After 250 Years" (Jed Arthur Cooper); (31) Minutes of Business Meeting; (32) Conference Program; and (33) Membership List. (EH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 413 254

The Journal of Educational Philosophy and History

SO 026 914

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
David C. Snelgrove
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

An Annual Publication of the Society of Philosophy and History of Education
Volume 44 1993

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Editor: Wayne Willis, *Morehead State University*

Editorial Advisory Board:

Mary Lou Aylor, *Central Michigan University*
Timothy J. Bergen, *University of South Carolina*
Jim Bowman, *University of Central Arkansas*
Dalton B. Curtis, Jr., *Southeast Missouri State University*
Richard J. Elliott, *University of New Orleans*
Charles Fazzaro, *University of Missouri*
William H. Fisher, *University of Montana*
Louis Goldman, *Wichita State University*
Joe L. Green, *Louisiana State University, Shreveport*
Karl J. Jost, *University of Tennessee*
Spencer J. Maxcy, *Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge*
Franklin Parker, *Western Carolina University*
Robert Reilly, *University of Arkansas*
Douglas J. Simpson, *Texas Christian University*
David Snelgrove, *Oklahoma City Public Schools*
Sam Stack, *West Virginia University*
Martha Tevis, *University of Texas - Pan American*
Gene Thibadeau, *Indiana University of Pennsylvania*
James Van Patten, *University of Arkansas*

The *Journal of Educational Philosophy and History* is a publication of the Society of Philosophy & History of Education (formerly the Southwestern Philosophy of Education Society). It includes papers presented at the annual meeting of the Society. The opinions expressed in the respective works are those of the individual authors, and not the position of the Society, the editor, or the publishers.

Membership in the Society is open to anyone interested in the profession of education. Only members may present papers at the annual meeting. A directory of members is included in the back of this volume. Dues vary in accordance with the vote of the membership and may be mailed to the Treasurer. Copies of the journal are also available from the treasurer. The officers of the Society for 1993-94 are:

President	Mary Lou Aylor	Central Michigan University
President Elect	Richard Elliott	University of New Orleans
Secretary	Timothy J. Bergen	University of South Carolina
Treasurer	Mary Lou Aylor	Central Michigan University

The copyright of the *Journal of Educational Philosophy and History* in the name of the Society of Philosophy & History of Education protects the rights of the individual authors who have contributed their thoughts to this volume. For purposes of reproduction, written permission of the individual authors must be secured. A scholarly entry, moreover, must be used noting the *Journal of Educational Philosophy and History* as the source of first publication.

©

Copyright 1994
by the
Society of Philosophy & History of Education

The Journal of Educational Philosophy & History

A Publication of the Society of Philosophy and History of Education 1994
Volume 44

Table of Contents

The Presidential Address:
THE EDUCATIONAL REVOLUTION IN KENTUCKY, OR HOW TO BUILD THE PLANE AFTER YOU'RE OFF THE GROUND by Wayne Willis 1

The Seventh Annual William E. Drake Lecture:
WAS BILL DRAKE A RELIGIOUS PERSON? by William H. Fisher 5

INFERENCES FROM STUDIES ABOUT THE CONTRADICTORY ROLE OF ADULT EDUCATION IN THE UNIVERSITY by Henry R. Weinstock 11

CRITICAL PEDAGOGY, LIBERALISM, AND DEWEY by David Snelgrove 13

THE PRIVATIZATION OF SCHOOLS AND THE GENERAL WELFARE by Richard J. Elliott and Carol S. Stack 17

CHARACTER EDUCATION, VALUES EDUCATION, EQUITY EDUCATION AND POLITICS: A CHALLENGE TO AMERICAN EDUCATORS by Fred D. Kierstead 21

THE JUNKYARD DOG by Stanley D. Ivie 24

THE DEAD DOG by Stanley D. Ivie 27

RECONSTRUCTION AND DECONSTRUCTION: IMPLICATIONS OF CONTEMPORARY CRITICAL THEORY FOR QUALITATIVE RESEARCH TECHNIQUES by James D. Swartz 30

DERRIDA, DECONSTRUCTION, AND EDUCATION POLICY ANALYSIS by Charles J. Fazzaro 36

REFORM AND RECONSTRUCTION IN EDUCATION: COMMITMENT OR FAD by James Van Patten and James Bolding 40

MIND, CHARACTER, AND THE DEFERRAL OF GRATIFICATION: AN RX FOR EDUCATIONAL CHANGE by Louis Goldman 44

PRAGMATIC CONCEPTIONS OF COMMUNITY by Sam Stack 51

INTERNATIONAL PARTNERSHIPS IN EDUCATION by Margaret Clark and Annette Digby 55

A STUDY OF THE DEGREE OF PROGRESSIVISM AMONG ARKANSAS PUBLIC SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS: IMPLICATIONS FOR EDUCATIONAL REFORM by Ann E. Witcher 61

EDUCATION PHILANTHROPIST GEORGE PEABODY (1795-1869), GEORGE PEABODY COLLEGE FOR TEACHERS, NASHVILLE, AND THE PEABODY LIBRARY AND CONSERVATORY OF MUSIC, BALTIMORE: A BRIEF HISTORY by Franklin and Betty J. Parker 69

IT'S ALL IN THE WAY WE LOOK AT THINGS - IS IT? by Cornell Thomas 94

MEN'S ROLES IN WOMEN'S STUDIES: A CASE IN POINT by Joe L. Green 97

SOMEWHAT LESS THAN PERFECT: CARL SCHURZ'S POLICIES AND THE INDIAN SCHOOLS by Karen McKellips 100

THE BIOGRAPHY OF A RADICAL CHINESE FEMINIST AND REVOLUTIONARY (1875-1907) by Timothy J. Bergen, Jr. 105

NEW THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES ON EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS by Spencer J. Maxcy 110

IMAGES OF AFRICAN-AMERICAN TEACHERS IN THE AMERICAN SOUTH: A COLONIZED PEOPLE, CARRIERS OF THE NEW SLAVERY, OR HUMAN AGENTS by Clinton B. Allison 116

PAULO FREIRE'S INFLUENCE ON THE COMMUNITY OF FAITH, THROUGH RELIGIOUS EDUCATION by John M. Townsend 121

THE EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY OF MAO ZEDONG FROM 1949 TO 1976 by Hanfu Mi 124

MAJOR PARADIGMS FOR EDUCATIONAL REFORM IN OREGON by Bill Cowart 128

THE HEDGE SCHOOLS AND EDUCATION IN THE AMERICAN SOUTH by Karl J. Jost 134

INFLUENCES THAT SHAPED SUSAN BLOW'S INVOLVEMENT IN KINDERGARTEN EDUCATION by Paul D. Travers 140

KENNETH D. BENNE IN RETROSPECT by William H. Fisher 143

EFFECTIVE EDUCATION FOR AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS: A CULTURAL MODEL by Barley L. McSwine 150

THOMAS JEFFERSON AFTER 250 YEARS by Jed Arthur Cooper 154

MINUTES OF BUSINESS MEETINGS 158

CONFERENCE PROGRAM 162

MEMBERSHIP LIST 170

The Presidential Address:

THE EDUCATIONAL REVOLUTION IN KENTUCKY, OR HOW TO BUILD THE PLANE AFTER YOU'RE OFF THE GROUND

Wayne Willis
Morehead State University

Educational reform since the early 80's has been something much talked about but little done. We meet, we argue, we generate ideas, we write them down, we carefully place them in our file cabinets, and we go on doing things pretty much the way we did before.

Kentucky, on the other hand, is actually attempting to implement some of the most radical (and I believe positive) reforms in the state's educational history. That history is not a glorious one. Compared to other states, Kentucky is traditionally at or near the bottom on a variety of measures of educational commitment and educational success, including standardized test scores, per pupil expenditures, and teacher salaries. We have a very high drop out rate, low attendance rates for those who haven't dropped out, and (in my judgment) an astonishing level of political corruption in many school districts.

Some of you heard me talk about these problems in detail three years ago, but let me again mention a few examples. A state audit of the Floyd County schools four years ago said that the school system was an "educational" system in name only. In reality, it was an institution whose primary function was to use children to generate income for the adult bureaucracy. Kids spent enormous amounts of time and energy selling candy, ornaments, and magazines to raise money for the schools. This was not your usual candy sale to buy new band uniforms or props for the theatre club. Enormous amounts of money were raised and were used to pay for normal school operating expenses, like administrators' salaries and school heating bills. One twelve year-old's contribution to the school budget through sales was more than what the Prestonsburg mayor paid in taxes. In 1986-87 Floyd County residents paid $1.5 million to the schools in property taxes. The kids, through door-to-door and vending machine sales, raised $1.7 million for the schools. They had very little time for less profitable activities like social studies and language arts.

One reason adults pay so little in property taxes to the schools is that in many districts tax assessors under assess property at anyone's request. A $200,000 rental property in Pike county was assessed at $22,100. A $350,000 house was simply never assessed and the owner never paid a school tax on it. Reo Johns, the tax assessor responsible for these and hundreds of other similar examples, eventually left office after the Lexington press published repeated investigative reports about his abuses. Don't worry about poor Reo, though: last May the school board named him the school superintendent. By the way, in that same county, the prosecutor responsible for going after folks who don't pay their taxes went for twelve straight years without prosecuting a single tax evader, though the list of those who had not paid included thousands of names.

One other example of abuse of power in the schools has to do with hiring practices. In the long-time economically depressed eastern region of the state, the local school system is often the largest employer in the county. School boards and superintendents have often passed out school jobs (assistant superintendent, teacher, janitor, teachers aid, etc.) to friends, family, and campaign contributors. This is widely perceived in eastern Kentucky as a legitimate privilege of office, not an abuse of power. I was amazed when I moved to the region to discover that the open search process which is strictly monitored in most schools and universities is unheard of in most eastern Kentucky school districts. Prior to passage of the Kentucky Education Reform Act, the State Board of Education considered a policy that would require all school districts to publish announcements of job openings. The state school superintendents association vigorously opposed the policy, arguing that it was the superintendents' prerogative to hire who they want, when they want, without public fuss. Again, much to my amazement, the state board backed down and simply required that openings be posted on the bulletin board in the school board office.

Despite the incredible problems Kentucky education has faced, it is now in the throes of an educational revolution that, should it succeed, might move Kentucky to the head of the class and make it a model to be emulated by other states. I call it a revolution; state department officials call it a paradigm shift. Whether or not the changes are radical enough for either term is debatable. Many of the reforms have been tried elsewhere before: many are being tried elsewhere now. But, given where Kentucky education has been, and given the comprehensive nature of the reform, I think there is something revolutionary about it all.

Let me give you an overview of the process that has created the revolution in Kentucky education. First, several factors contributed to reform climate in Kentucky:

- The 80's reform movement nationally, with the proliferation of reform reports like "A Nation at Risk" called attention to the need for reform.
- Consultants brought in to work with Louisville chamber of commerce told business leaders there that business was suffering in Kentucky because we had the worst educated work force in America
- Media (particularly newspapers) did investigative reports that accented the problems of schools, particularly financial problems and problems of

political corruption
- Non-government organizations were created by volunteers from the community to reform schools

The reform climate was right and in 1985 66 property poor school districts (mostly rural, scattered across the state) sued the state on the grounds that the distribution of school funds based upon property taxes was in violation of the state constitution. The state constitution says that the state will provide an equitable and efficient school system. In 1989 the state supreme court gave them more than they bargained for, when it ruled that the current system violated not only the equity clause in the constitution, but also the efficiency clause. In effect, the court was saying that it wasn't enough just the redistribute funds: every law, act, and regulation concerning public education was declared to be unconstitutional. The court further ordered the legislature to create a whole new body of school law and gave them a year to do it. The court order made no mention, by the way, of the governor. This was the legislature's task.

The governor at the time, Wallace Wilkerson, did not want to be left out, so he presented his own plan for reforming education. The legislature shot it down, and left a particularly combative governor in a particularly combative mood. Some observers believe that this tension between the governor and the legislature gave extra incentive to the legislature to get it right when they developed their proposal. The governor would look for any excuse to subvert the legislature's reform plan.

The legislature created a task force for educational reform that was outside the normal legislative structure and procedures. That task force took the posture that they wanted to bring about real educational change, not just a face lift, and they assumed that such change would have to come from outside of the state. One of the bones of contention in the implementation of the reforms has been the fact that initially the schools and universities of Kentucky had virtually no role in planning the reforms. The task force was particularly distrustful of the universities and their colleges of education, so we had even less input than the public school teachers.

Despite a common "we don't trust outsiders" attitude in Kentucky the task force brought in three consultants to help them devise a new state school system. Working together for most of a year, the task force and the consultants created approximately 850 pages of public school law. The call for educational reform was so strong that the legislature passed the new law, despite the fact that it included a $1 billion tax increase over two years to fund educational reform. The governor, who had tried to be a stumbling block to the legislatures efforts and who had threatened to veto the bill, eventually decided that he didn't want to be the governor who blocked the bill that could revolution Kentucky schools. With great pomp and circumstance and dozens of video cameras running to record the event, the governor signed the law and added it to his list of accomplishments as governor. The law was called the Kentucky Education Reform Act and is normally referred to as KERA.

Major Features of KERA

Let me summarize the act by identifying nine features I consider particularly prominent.

1. Increased Funding - In the early 80's the wealthier school districts were spending about $3500 per pupil on education. The poorer districts were spending about $1800 per pupil. Even the spending in the wealthiest district in the state was below the national average. Currently in Kentucky we are spending about $4800 per pupil on education. That is a dramatic improvement, particularly for the poorer districts, but it is still well below the national average. During the first year of KERA, the average Kentucky school teacher got a 20% raise. In some districts teachers got 40% raises.

2. Outcome-Based Education - This resulted in the redefinition of goals and a new freedom for schools in seeking to meet those goals. Central to all of this is the idea that schools are to do more than dispense knowledge: they are to teach kids knowledge and skills that have meaning and value in the outside world. Before KERA the state told teachers how many minutes per week they were to spend on mathematics, for example. After KERA the state says, in effect, "Here's what we want the students to be able to do. If you want to do interdisciplinary activities, integrate the curriculum, and stop counting minutes that's fine. Meet the goal; that's what matters."

3. New ways of Assessing Student Achievement - The reform represents a move away from traditional standardized tests to NAEP-like tests and then ultimately to performance events. Here's an example a the kind of performance events they are developing. Give a student three bags of rocks, a spoon, a scale, a cup of water, and a chart showing characteristics of different kinds of rocks. Ask the student to identify the rocks he/she has been given. Another example of the kind of assessment the state is trying to do was borrowed from an exam for eighth graders in the Netherlands. It is called "In Defense of the Homeland." In 1980 a country has a national budget of $500 million and a defense budget of $30 million. In 1981 the country has a national budget of $605 million and a defense budget of $35 million. The student is asked to: 1) argue that the defense budget decreased and 2) argue that the defense budget increased. That item is quite a bit different from the typical American test item where we ask: 30 is what percent of 500?

4. Non-Graded Primary School - The reform assumes that there are better ways to organize learning than by traditional academic disciplines and children's birthdays. The reform calls for multi-age, flexible grouping with lots of interdisciplinary thematic units.

5. Site-Based Management of Schools - These councils are supposed to help reduce the power of local demagogues by giving teachers and parents more control over what is taught and how. Councils consist of teachers elected by the teachers, parents elected by the PTA, and the principal. They are supposed to exercise much power over day to day operations, as well as write job descriptions and selecte new hires.

6. Family Resource Centers and Youth Centers - Recognizing the larger social problems (especially poverty) that powerfully inhibit the schools' effectiveness, the legislature included these centers to assist the family's of at risk students.

7. New Assessment and Reward System for Schools - The state will hold schools accountable for making progress toward goals. There are financial rewards for schools that show progress a a threat of state take-over for schools that fail.

8. Office of Accountability - Recognizing that not every district is going to make the changes willfully, the law creates an office of educational accountability to monitor the whole process and use the power of the courts to force schools to reform.

9. To lead the reform process, KERA created an appointed, professional position of commissioner of education. To make sure the commissioner had a supportive team he/she could work with, the law required the dismissal of every employee of the state department of education within a little over a year from passage of the act. These former employees could apply for new positions under the new commissioner.

These nine major features represent my judgment about the most prominent parts of the reform in Kentucky, but they certainly provide nothing more than a brief overview of the law. You probably do get the sense from this overview that Kentucky is trying to reform virtually every aspect of education at once. And, of course, chaos has ensued.

Part of the problem is that with all of these changes happening at once, no one can tell you exactly what is supposed to happen tomorrow. Early in the reform process if you called the state department hot line with a question about implementing some aspect of KERA, nine times out of ten officials there would say, "We don't know," or "We haven't decided yet what to do about that," or "I am a lame duck and can tell you nothing." This situation is finally getting better, but in the first two years of KERA, getting an authoritative answer to any question was virtually impossible. The metaphor that state department officials began to use to talk about the implementation process was the airplane launched into the sky while it was still under construction. "We are building the plane after we are off the ground." It seems an appropriate metaphor, given the urgency of the change and the sense of panic that a lot of teachers and state department officials feel.

There have been other problems in the implementation of the reform.

1. *Funding* - Despite a $1 billion tax increase, many complain that the reform is under funded. The tax increase was presented to the public as a way of fixing the schools, but all of the money did not go to education. In fact, the last report I saw in the press said that approximately one third of this tax increase was actually budgeted for education. Many parents also complain that, while the reform includes heavy funding of new programs for the gifted and students with academic problems, relatively little new money is going for the education of the average student.

2. *Outcome based education* - Outcome based education has gotten a lot of press, but not nearly enough has been done to retrain teachers to teach to new goals. Most are pretty good knowledge dispensers, but many are in the fog about the more sophisticated intellectual and social goals the reform establishes. A lot of money is set aside for staff development, and local districts decide how to use it. But many of these districts are relying heavily on one-shot, one-day in service workshops, rather than long-term, retooling. Though I have referred to the reform in Kentucky as revolutionary and the state department has called it a paradigm shift, legislators seem to think teachers need relatively little retraining to teach in the reformed schools.

3. *Assessment* - We haven't yet developed the "test worth teaching to" but it does appear that educational reform can be assessment driven. When the early returns on student achievement have come in, even some of the most obstinate school districts have started implementing reforms.

4. *Non-graded primary school* - The non-graded primary school may be the most dramatic feature of the reform, but in some schools this has been implemented as nothing more than split grade classes: one teacher dividing his/her direct instruction time between two distinct class groups based upon age.

5. *Site-based decision-making* - Some superintendents are trying in every way possible to subvert this. Often the parents and teachers know little about their roles on the councils and just accept whatever the principal tells them their roles are. When councils have been more assertive, superintendents have been known to try to control elections to the councils.

6. *Assessment of schools* - The school's performance is rated on the basis of the performance of the students, initially on writing exhibited in student portfolios. But the holistic assessment of portfolios is particularly subjective, and getting consistency in scoring across the state has been quite difficult. The accuracy of the assessments is further complicated by 1) the fact that the teachers are sometimes rating their own students portfolios and want to give a portfolio a higher rating than it deserves for the sake of the student, and 2) the fact that teachers have much to gain by inflating the ratings of the students in their own schools. In many cases these assessments are essentially self-evaluations, with all the problems inherent in them.

7. *Office of Accountability* - This office has done much, including forcing out three superintendents and one whole school board in districts near the university where I teach. But the Office of Accountability is apparently still in the dark about much of what is and isn't being done in the schools. Many teachers and parents will complain privately about local violations of state education law, but few will actually report them to the state.

General Observations

There is much resistance to KERA from teachers, parents, and administrators. Teachers tend to be a conservative lot who don't want their boats rocked. Many never really believed Kentucky schools were that bad, and they don't want to change. The initial chaos generated by reform doesn't seem very productive, and the teachers feel little ownership over reform because they had little input into it initially. In some schools teachers have profound misconceptions about what KERA calls for (in some cases because administrators have blocked lines of communication to them. A teacher told me this summer that she had never received a writing assessment handbook the state had sent out, so she went to the superintendent and asked for one. He told her he had destroyed them all because he didn't want the teachers to know about it. I think many of the teachers' frustrations grow out of the fact that they haven't been properly trained to do the things they are being asked to do. For these and many other reasons, some teachers are putting bumper stickers on their cars that say "I DON'T KERA."

Other teachers, I might add, report to me that KERA

is the best thing that ever happened to their schools, that their principals are making the transition a smooth one, and that they are thrilled to see the kids more actively involved in the learning process. It makes for interesting graduate classes for me when one teacher asserts that a reform won't work and another asserts that it is working beautifully.

Many Kentucky students are unhappy with KERA because the only kind of education they know is the kind that is organized by age and subject matter, and where assessment is reported with a letter grade. There are also a lot of parents in Kentucky who retain Puritan conceptions that children should be beaten and bored a lot. They are anxious about educational reforms that promise to make the process more meaningful and more humane.

Perhaps the strongest opposition has come from superintendents and school board members who rightly recognize that the reform intends to dramatically reduce their power.

If KERA succeeds, I believe it will be a significant chapter in the history of American education, but first it has enormous obstacles to surmount. The stakes are high, because, if it fails, it may be decades before Kentuckians will be willing to try such an experiment again. In my judgment, the education of thousands of Kentucky children is in the balance.

The Seventh Annual William E. Drake Lecture

WAS BILL DRAKE A RELIGIOUS PERSON?

William H. Fisher
The University of Montana

I have been honored to be invited to present the Seventh Annual William E. Drake Lecture. Those who have had this honor before me have been, without exception, excellent scholars and speakers who no doubt made a greater contribution than I will make today. However, in light of my tremendous respect for Bill Drake and his memory, I have frankly hoped that I would somehow "measure up"--and not only that, but that my remarks might contribute in some small way to a better understanding of who Bill was, and how his philosophy as expressed orally and in his writings, might come under the rubric of "that which is religious." If I succeed in my endeavors along this line, I will be thankful for (as everyone knows who knew Bill Drake) if indeed he had a religion, it surely was not of the orthodox kind. Thus I admit that I have ventured onto territory which is a bit shaky. In passing, I want to mainly thank two people for my part on this occasion: (1) Martha Tevis who invited me on behalf of the Texas Educational Foundations Society; (2) Jack C. Willers who, following prolonged conversations (mostly by telephone) urged me to go ahead with the topic I was toying with, and thus Jack stiffened my backbone and made me feel that maybe I could handle it.

A certain amount of analyzing terms seems to be in order at the start. I could have chosen such a topic as: "Did Bill Drake have a religion?" However, I consciously stayed clear of that topic inasmuch as the word religion seems somehow more definitive than the word religious. And in the interest of just plain honesty, one must admit that it is not a simple matter to pin down the nature of William E. Drake's religious orientation--although I do emphatically believe (at least in terms of my interpretation) that Bill was profoundly religious in his orientation to life and its problems[1] In regard to this first footnote, I am a bit ambivalent regarding any kind of "categorizing" when it comes to our friend. So, if this problem bothers you (as it has me), then possibly the term metaphysics is one which may be properly used at this point inasmuch as such a term frequently impinges upon both religion and philosophy.[2]

Fervor. Webster, as per the same edition cited in footnote #1 above, in definition #2, p. 516: "great warmth of emotion." Great warmth of emotion surely was characteristic of Bill Drake's support of various causes, or opposition to the same! And under "religious" (ibid., p. 1200) we find words such as "conscientiously exact; careful; scrupulous." Such words and terms as the foregoing bear emphasis and indeed, they are emphatic in their own right. My opinion is that they are commensurate with the character of William E. Drake: When he believed something that he thought was important to the world of education (and thus to the world at large), he did so strongly and emphatically. At the risk of overly emphasizing my point, I will add the obvious: I have chosen these dictionary quotes as further evidence that William E. Drake was indeed "a religious person." In the possibility that those who have not known the late Bill Drake in terms of a close relationship and understanding--if indeed such persons should want to follow-up on my perception that he was a person of strong feelings--then you should peruse his limited-edition autobiography A Voice From Mount Parnassus. As just one example read the portion (pp. 230-231) wherein he explains how he was eased-out as secretary of the Philosophy of Education Society after many years in that capacity. He named names of those who were instrumental in this move and characterizes them as a "coterie of villains." Frankly, reading this kind of shocked me, as the names were familiar to me and without exception, they were leaders in philosophy of education and were individuals who philosophically maintained much the same pattern-of-thought as did Bill Drake.

As I am writing this, I have at hand a letter from William E. Drake dated June the 15th, 1982. Bill was responding to a letter which I had written him, but since I did not keep a copy of my letter I am unaware of its specific content. However, judging from the contents of the message from Bill, it is evident that I had written to him on some subject closely related to religion.[3] It is indeed fortuitous that I unearthed this statement of Bill's--sufficiently so that I will take the liberty of quoting from it at some length:

> As for the matter of religion, I would say, each man to his faith, whatever it may be. My position in this respect is not a matter of being negative to the churchman's purpose, but is solidly based upon the way in which social thought has developed through the evolution of the human mind. The fact that our ministers of God continue to preach a doctrine suitable to the knowledge of cultures of more than two thousand years past is, to me, the present chief means of blinding our people to the growth of the free scientific and creative mind. I would be a willing participant in discussing the matter at one of our annual meetings if enough of our members would be so interested. Why not use some literature such as Parrington's Main Currents in American Thought as a substitute for the Old Testament? (A few "typos" were in this letter, and I will keep it on hand in case any interested party should care to check-it-out.)

Those who have been familiar with William E. Drake's conversations on the subject of religion, will surely recognize some major themes that Bill Drake above dwelled upon. Firstly, I think we should recognize that he was sincere in his admonition--each man to his

(own) faith--for surely Professor Drake was a strong supporter of The Bill of Rights. When he castigated "our ministers" for preaching a doctrine more suitable to a culture of two thousand years ago than today, in my opinion he was thinking of the typical fundamentalists, rather than the liberal pastors to be found serving some congregations today. We would have to admit that the latter are in the minority. Then, when Bill mentioned Parrington's Main Currents in American Thought, it frankly "rang a bell with me."[4]

One test of whether an individual is a religious person surely is rooted in the problem of whether he/she believes in personal immortality.[5] Since I have stated elsewhere that belief in personal immortality is not the major test of religiosity,[6] I won't labor the point other than to reemphasize that support for the hypothesis of individual survival is a significant indication of a person's attitudes toward religion. Since any certitude was lacking (on my part) regarding this aspect of Bill Drake's belief system, I did the obvious--I phoned Jack Willers in Nashville and received a response that was very helpful.[7] A kind of synopsis of what Jack told me follows, especially as regards the possibility of personal survival following physical death. These are not direct quotes; however, they are statements as interpreted by me as the two of us conversed: Bill Drake would have liked to support "a yes answer" to the question of whether there is personal survival after death. But in the interests of just plain honesty, he could not--or more accurately it may be said that William E. Drake had his doubts regarding this problem. Dr. Willers said that when Bill's mother died and also with the passing of his wife, Zelma, this wanting to believe came on quite strongly.[8]

Bill Drake has stated: "Since childhood I have had a deep religious outlook...Who is God?...The important question is not whether one believes in God, but in what kind of God one believes in."[9](sic.) The foregoing quote from Drake's autobiography should lay at rest the problem of whether Dr. Drake was a religious person!

On June the 14th, 1993, I phoned Jack Willers again with my principal purpose being to question him as to whether Drake's beliefs regarding religion were much the same as John Dewey's, especially as expressed in the latter's A Common Faith. In answering me, Professor Willers specifically used the word "parallel." Well, parallel is not the same, obviously, as identical. Possibly a viable explanation of Drake's philosophy of religion as contrasted with Dewey's is to say that they were quite similar.[10]

In further explication of Dewey vis-a-vis Drake on this subject, we may cite a statement from my friend Bob Roth at Fordham University. As a kind of "prologue" we will remind you that Dewey through much of his career, sought ways to bring people together and to eliminate as far as possible the alienation which is part-and-parcel of human conflict.[11] In his John Dewey and Self-Realization Roth stated: "It would seem ...plausible to accept Dewey's own reason for adhering to the term (i.e. God). He wanted to dissociate himself from militant atheism which shares with supernaturalism the separation of man from nature."[12] The foregoing statement underlines the fact that those critics of Dewey's philosophy on the ground that he was some kind of an "atheist," were way off base! And by the same token, those who may have had the mistaken belief that because Bill Drake was at times a vigorous critic of organized religion, this made him an atheist--such critics of Dr. Drake are also way off base.

Perhaps we are prone to dwell too long on this problem of institutionalized religion. At the same time, it is a problem and one which through the ages has helped raise the question: Just who is a religious person! Furthermore, what part has the organized church had in holding back the march of human progress? The latter question is an extremely complex one. Although it is unfair to criticize one social institution unmercifully, at the same time and if we are to view organized religion in an historic context, a student of the subject will have to admit that such institutions as The Inquisition proved itself to be a bulwark to the progress of humankind. By the use of physical and mental torture--in many cases the end result literally being murder--The Inquisition manifested itself in ways which were clearly unconscionable.[13]

While I was in the midst of working on this manuscript, I was reading a biography of Galileo.[14] Not only was this "exercise" a very interesting one, but possibly in some fortuitous sense I was prompted to read it at this time because it so well fitted some problems about which I had been thinking. Living at the close of the Renaissance (his dates were 1564-1642) when an element of empirical thinking was beginning to appear upon the scene, in his challenge to the Aristotlean way of viewing the universe and his support of the new Copernican way, he was able to garner some substantial agreement among men of vision and honor. This was true both within and without the church.[15] But there was never quite enough support to render him free of the potent threats of official church circles, these under-girded by the decrees of The Inquisition. And while we may say that he was not forced to pay the supreme penalty, nonetheless there may be no doubt that the persecutions that came his way would have destroyed persons of lesser stamina. All this lends itself to a further reaffirmation that when the church--yesterday or today--attempts to influence its affiliates and its various adherents with what is correct and what is incorrect in the realm of scientific truth, it is on very shaky ground, to put it mildly!

My previous statement indicates that--if any reaffirmation were needed--that the basic principles for which Galileo stood in the sense of the search for truth irrespective of where that search may lead; in short, said principles have been threatened from Galileo's day until today. True, we have possibly come a-ways in advancing the cause of liberty since those days. That is, a person who takes a firm stand on behalf of some tenable hypothesis or some tentative truth--said individual has a better chance today at least in the United States of America, of coming out of the situation with his physical body intact. However, his/her emotional status may be very much affected, and the individual could suffer the loss of his/her professional position. Surely the latter eventuality is not much different than an actual death sentence.

I am sure there are persons who are listening to and/or reading this paper who have suffered at least emotional damage as a result of interference with their basic academic freedom. Other cases, perhaps better known to the public, are extant. Before I bring this portion of my presentation to closure, I want to mention the famous Bertrand Russell case involving The City College of New York in the early forties. This dramatic imbroglio

perhaps was not the cause-celebre of first import in the history of academic freedom, but certainly the notoriety which it involved and the fundamental principles which were at stake, must impel us to use the illustration as a most significant one.

Russell's chronological years were 1872-1970. He was beyond a shadow of a doubt one of the greatest philosophers of the present century. Not only were his publications exemplary, but his educational backgrounds were equally so, and his teaching credentials read like something which could with credence be said, "He was a teacher of world renown." It is true that because of his stands on a number of controversial issues, he was frequently in trouble with the authorities--both at the institutions where he taught and with the higher governmental authorities.[16]

At the time of his appointment to the faculty of CCNY, Russell had been teaching at UCLA, and the new position was to include a stint of a little better than a year--from February 1941 to June 1942. "Russell was pleased to be going to City College as it had a liberal reputation, and a record of fostering the education of the lower classes..." (see p. 136). But alas, this was by no means the end of the story. Bishop William T. Manning of the Episcopal Church diocese of New York, an old adversary of Russell's and an arch-conservative in both religion and politics, jumped into the brewing controversy with both feet. (ibid.) Stimulated by Manning's leadership, other ultra-conservative forces and individuals got into the fray, including the Hearst Press, many a Tammany Hall politician--yes, Tammany was the Democratic Party in NYC at the time as it was influenced by Irish-Catholic ward héelers galore--and Manning's campaign in opposition to Russell was ardently supported by Catholic lay organizations including the State Council of the Knights of Columbus, the latter issuing a statement describing Russell as "an articulate spearhead of the radical, atheistic and anti-religious elements of our time." (ibid., p. 137).

Liberals from across the USA also jumped into what had become a question of national import: Is Bertrand Russell "a fit person" to teach at CCNY? The philosophy department at City College held its ground and said that Russell's appointment would remain intact. John Dewey, Albert Einstein and many another prominent intellectual rallied to Russell's defense. Einstein being the always perceptive observer of events and having a guesstimate as to how the controversy would end, penned the following poem: "It keeps repeating itself--In this world, so fine and honest; The Parson alarms the populace, The genius is executed." (see ibid., p. 144).

It certainly needs to be interpolated at this point, that, especially for the times in which he lived, Russell's views of Marriage and Morals were "advanced." He had written a book some years before the CCNY episode on this very subject. In the opus, he had taken much the same stand as had the well known Denver jurist Ben Lindsey who advocated "trial marriage" as a kind of antidote--a treatment for the endless stream of divorce and broken marriages with which he had to deal when he was on the bench. Needless to say, Judge Lindsey in general terms paid a price for his stand, but one not so dramatic as what happened to the Russell appointment: You guessed it, he was never permitted to teach at CCNY.

When the Manning forces could not get their way with the administration of the college, they turned to the courts. A Mrs. Jean Kay, a citizen of Brooklyn who had no connection with CCNY, received the ardent support of attorney Joseph Goldstein. Goldstein, according to authors Feinberg and Kasrils, had been a magistrate under a previous Tammany administration, "...(and) was a masterpiece of character assassination." (see ibid., p. 152.) Justice John E. McGeehan of the New York Supreme Court heard the testimonies of both sides to the dispute and--in the light of the emotionally charged atmosphere pervading this whole affair-ruled in favor of Mrs. Kay and her attorney Goldstein, and against CCNY's appointment of Bertrand Russell. It is possibly worth mentioning that it was characteristic and circumstantial that in 1950, less than ten years after this messy affair, the Nobel Prize Committee, although at the time not warranted to award the accolade in Philosophy, did award Russell a Nobel Prize in Literature.

Have I spent too much time and space, relatively speaking, on the foregoing case? I think not. I fully believe that if Bill Drake were still around in this world and teaching as he once did at the University of Texas (and elsewhere), he would approve of my having illustrated a point with this particular, unfortunate event in American history. The case represent a graphic instance of what can happen when the forces of organized, right-wing religion run rampant. And even though fifty odd years have transpired since the CCNY episode, you and I as the students of Bill Drake, realize that these forces of bigotry still are active in American life; and if they are beneath the surface, they are not far beneath, and we as the followers of a kind of philosophy that Bill supported, owe it to his memory to combat these dark forces, just as he did!

The topic which I assigned myself on this occasion is much like other topics I have assigned myself in the past--just too much territory to cover. But leastwise, I hope that my discussions will lead some of you to check further into Bill Drake's life and his contributions to the uplift of humanity.[17] The fact that he wrote a rather comprehensive autobiography should not dissuade Bill's friends (and others) from writing articles or even books regarding this-or-that phase of his notable career.

One quality in Bill which influenced me very much was his insistence that intellectual content in the work which we as teachers do, must be always uppermost as we engage in our various endeavors. Not only by direction but also by in-direction this is implicit in one of his better known books.[18] In his historical writings, as a further example of this point, he makes plain his preference for Jefferson rather than Jackson as a political leader.[19] While many religious persons prefer the quality of intuition over that of cognition, this was not true of Professor Drake. My own leanings are frankly toward intuition--at least in those situations where we have great difficulty in making a final decision as to a course of action, or as to some philosophical problem.[20] I hasten to add, however, that even though I never had the pleasure of an actual, formal course with Bill Drake, in more ways than one, he influenced me, and the foregoing is one of those ways. Thus, I find myself saying on occasion when I believe that I am leaning too-too much toward a subjective approach as I ruminate regarding some problem: "Bill, slow down--Bill Drake would say that you are letting your emotions get the better of you!"

Previous reference has been made to Drake's admi-

ration and respect for John Dewey, and how their thinking along the lines of religion was somehow parallel, or similar.[21] In this discussion, it is pertinent to draw upon Dewey's psychology. While he was not all the way into gestalt psychology, he surely was leaning in that direction as illustrated by his oft-quoted quip regarding E.L. Thorndike's behaviorism: When asked in some public discussion while on the faculty at Columbia University what he thought of Thorndike's statistical (or quantitative) approach to psychological problems, Dewey answered to the effect that it reminded him of the way the farmers in his native Vermont determined what price to expect on their pigs as they prepared to ship the latter to the urban markets. The big question was, of course, how much the hogs weighed. And the way they determined that, was to find a lengthy board and with the help of a proper fulcrum, they would balance this lever precisely then place the hog on one end of the lever (holding it gently so that it wouldn't fall off) and then pile rocks on the other end until everything balanced. Then they would estimate the weight of the rocks! This actual (or apocryphal) story from Dewey was gleaned from the years before gestalt psychology became a major challenge to Thorndikian Behaviorism--but it constitutes ample evidence that Dewey wasn't enamored of a strictly quantitative methodology in his search for a viable philosophy (or psychology) of education. And I will postulate that like Dewey, Bill Drake never was wedded to statistics--bless his great soul!

Although Dewey died in 1952, 'tisn't surprising that his influence to this day is muchly felt. And if we consider the following quote, 'tistn't surprising that Drake found so much in Dewey's writings that he could (and did!) support. Robert J. Roth, S.J., writing but a few years ago, had this to say: "...during a teaching career of more than fifty years he (JD) was no ivory-tower intellectual. He believed that the philosopher should be engaged in the human clash of social purposes and aspirations. Problems of poverty and disease, social justice and the underprivileged, the dignity of the human person and the possibilities for the development of human potentialities--all these were important to him. Consequently, he was anxious to assist in the improvement of the institutions which concerned themselves with these issues."[22]

We have previously indicated how--insofar as it was an issue in those days--Dewey leaned toward gestalt psychology and away from crass behaviorism. Consistent with his stance on this issue was his attempt to search for a holistic perspective when viewing any problem which seemingly invited an analysis which implicitly might lead to fragmentation. In fact, it has been widely stated that even though Dewey drifted away from his earlier orientation toward Hegel's philosophy, he never drifted all the way to a complete departure from Hegel.[23] Even in his later years, Dewey stated: "There is greater richness and greater variety of insight in Hegel than in any other systematic philosopher except Plato."[24] Apropos the foregoing quote, it is reasonable to conclude that one reason Dewey never completely departed from Hegel's philosophy was because of the latter's insistence that fragmentation as a tendency among philosophical thinkers was a tendency to be avoided like the plague, and that wholeness, or a holistic approach, was the way to go. Surely this "way to go" fits a well balanced attitude toward religion. It explains also why Dewey (and Drake!) tended to avoid super-naturalisms of all kinds because: (1) They fly in the face of logic and solid intellectualism; and (2) Supernaturalistic religions tend to fragment groups and lead to conflict; and also within the individual, this ultra-conservative stance leads frequently to confusion and a high degree of emotionalism.

I reemphasize at this point three aspects of why a person may be profoundly religious and yet he/she refuses to be a conformist: (1) Critique of an institution doesn't necessarily mean opposition to the original purpose for which the institution was founded. "That Dewey's own strictures bore on existing religious beliefs, organizations and institutions, rather than upon religion itself is a tenable inference..."[25] (2) Gestalt. Wholeness: "See the whole picture"--or in short, seek a holistic way out of confusion and fragmentation. (3) Reject a super-naturalistic approach to basic religions. It is worth mentioning that while the previous point may not satisfy some persons, nonetheless and as nearly as this writer can ascertain in the spirit of a Bill Drake and one of his philosophical heroes, John Dewey, my "guesstimate" is that neither of them would have been sympathetic toward a religion which rejected humanism--a humanism based in naturalism.[26]

As I wound up the rough draft of this ms. (end June, 1993), I was attempting to think of some piece from literature which might occupy a fitting closure.[27] Such a closing statement should be consistent with the personality and the spirit of the individual involved. It was then that I perused William Cullen Bryant's well known poem Thanatopsis. And it seems to me that the final lines are consistent with Bill Drake's philosophy of religion:

> So live, that when thy summons comes to join
> The innumerable caravan, that moves
> To that mysterious realm where each shall take
> His chamber in the silent halls of death,
> Thou go, not like the quarry slave at night
> Scourged to his dungeon, but sustained and
> soothed
> By an unfaltering trust, approach thy grave
> Like one who wraps the drapery of his couch
> About him, and lies down to pleasant dreams.

Notes

[1]We cannot completely escape "categorizing" in this paper, so I will venture to state that Professor Drake's ruminations (and actions) in those affairs of life which impinge upon that which is religious, had a close relationship to modern humanism. One definition of humanism is to the effect that it is a movement which is "...monotheistic, rationalistic (and) that holds that man is capable of self-fulfillment, ethical conduct, etc. without recourse to supernaturalism." (See Webster's New World Dictionary, second college edition, latest copyright 1980, p. 683).

[2]I will illustrate this point by citing an example from a biography of the late Robert M. Hutchins, Unseasonable Truths--The Life of Robert Maynard Hutchins, by Harry S. Ashmore (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1989). I clearly am not saying that Bill Drake and Robert

Hutchins had the same philosophy of education, for surely they differed in said philosophy. What I am stating simply by way of illustrating one meaning of metaphysics is that Hutchins used the term so frequently because he had attempted during much of his adult life to find a substitute for the religion which he had lost. Not wanting to completely disavow certain religious loyalties, he searched for a word that was, in meaning, approximately "halfway" between religion on the one hand, and pure philosophy on the other. (See Chapter 15 of the Hutchins Biography: "Facts vs. Ideas.")

[3]At least a little analysis seems in order regarding Drake's statement to me: The vigor with which, especially in private conversations ("private" in this instance meaning not in the classroom setting, but more likely in an informal give-and-take setting), Bill laid down some rather potent blasts at the church; this no doubt influenced some to believe that he really was anti-religious. But I don't think so. William Earle Drake certainly was not the first thoughtful critic of organized religion to attack the church. Various kinds of liberals have attacked the church, while these same attackers were at heart believers and even devout individuals. Baruch Spinoza was a typical example among well known philosophers. He was Jewish and a believer if ever there was one, but his own synagogue officially booted him out. Bertrand Russell refers to him as "...the noblest and most lovable of the great philosophers." (See BR's A History of Western Philosophy, 1945 copyright, p. 569.) It is also well known that among our own Founding Fathers, the greatest of the great such as Franklin and Jefferson, were deists. In short, they had a religion although one admittedly unorthodox. And that's the point, unorthodox; and through the centuries the know-nothings have persecuted and killed all sorts and kinds of unorthodox thinkers.

[4]'Tis not stretching the point to state that in Parrington's three volume classic there is much about religion. There had to be, since many of the great classic works of American literature were written by those who were themselves profoundly religious, or were writing about persons and events related to religion. True, Parrington's social philosophy was left-of-center, although it clearly was not Marxist. When I attended the University of Washington during the thirties, Parrington's influence there "was all over the place"--and the main building in which English and Literature are taught, was named for that truly great teacher and writer. I had courses with a few of his students, but more to the point in ways informal as well as formal, the long stint he put-in at that university manifested itself in ways which I do not hesitate to say were eternal. Whatever liberal tendencies I have reflected from those days until these, are in part (although perhaps indirectly) the result of the impact of the teachings of Vernon Louis Parrington. And I can tell you that he and his students did not worship at the shrine of organized religion.

[5]Corliss Lamont's The Illusion of Immortality (NY: Ungar, 1965 last c.) is in my opinion clearly the strongest, most logical statement I have read in opposition to those who support immortality. I disagree with it, but I think it is definitely worth reading--in part because it forces the individual believer to think acutely in order to find answers to this particular humanist's well reasoned arguments.

[6]See my "Agnostics vis-a-vis Atheists" in the Proceedings of the SW. Philosophy of Education Society, 1984, Dalton B. Curtis, Jr., Editor.

[7]Anyone who knows Professor Willers and his grounding in religion--as well as his close and ongoing professional association with Bill Drake across many years--will appreciate the fact that Jack is very well qualified to give a viable analysis of what Professor Drake believed regarding various aspects of the broad problems related to Bill's approach to religion. (I kept notes as I was talking with Jack, and I know this took place during May, 1993, but I don't have the exact date.)

[8]Bill Drake surely was not alone in wanting to believe in immortality! This is a common phenomenon--and it seems to be a phenomenon among those of liberal persuasion, including a number of agnostics. My own "prejudices" may be apparent when I state it as my opinion that the attitude of wanting something could possibly indicate a quality in the individual of a strong leaning-in-that-direction. In his Will To Believe, William James identified himself quite strongly with the postulate if we want something enough--very much, that is--this quality of ardent hopefulness might actually bring that which we want into existence. Needless to say, such a one as Corliss Lamont strongly opposes "the will to believe" thesis.

[9]William E. Drake, A Voice From Mount Parnassus, The Autobiography and Poems, edited by Jack Conrad Willers, Vanderbilt University, 1992. (Drake b. 1903, d. 1989). Chapter 3: "Who Is God?" Quote is from p. 23.

[10]A person didn't have to know Bill Drake "all that well" in order to realize that John Dewey was one of his great heroes. (In passing, it is worth noting that Dewey's statement on religion in A Common Faith, is his main one, but surely he touched on religion in a number of his other writings.)

[11]While Dewey surely wasn't some "Norman Vincent Peale" kind of thinker, nonetheless and if it could be done honestly, he was looking for those philosophical points-of-agreement which could prevent fragmentation.

[12]Roth, John Dewey and Self-Realization (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1962), footnote #27, p. 108.

[13]In fairness we must state that the Counter Reformation developed some policies which caused the church to give up certain stances and practices for which it had been oft-criticized. At the same time the actual physical abuses (torture, etc.) which were institutionalized by The Inquisition, justify the use of the word unconscionable.

[14]Colin A. Ronan, Galileo (NY: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1974).

[15]Had Aristotle been alive at the time of "the big

fuss" over Galileo's experimental work and his conclusions, it is highly likely that he would not have joined in the proceedings of condemnation that characterized Galileo's opponents. But the historic fact was that philosophers and teachers of that epoch had attained such a frozen-in interpretation of Aristotle that it was virtually hopeless for Galileo's defenders to postulate what I have postulated in the first sentence of this footnote.

[16]The material herein contained has been mostly gleaned from Barry Feinberg and Ronald Kasrils, Bertrand Russell's America (NY: The Viking Press, 1974), Chapters 11 and 12 respectively titled: "A New York Appointment" and "The Chair of Indecency." Needless to say, this famous case has had treatment in numerous other publications.

[17]It is to be hoped that the still extant family of Dr. Drake will give its approval to a further production of Bill's autobiography. I know that Jack Willers has been working on this off-and-on, to bring to fruition something more than the very limited number of volumes so far published.

[18]Drake, The Intellectual Foundations of Modern Education (Columbus: charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1967).

[19]Actually, Professor Drake had great respect for both these leaders, but it is plain that he reserved greater respect for Jefferson, the latter obviously being one of the greatest intellectuals that this or any nation has produced.

[20]It would seem to the present writer (WHF) that no matter which direction the thoughtful individual leans--toward intuitive factors in decision-making or toward strict reliance upon cold-blooded intellect--the latter must have some say-so in this process. The late, great British philosopher Bertrand Russell, surely would agree with this perspective, as reflected in his many published writings.

[21]See footnote #10, above.

[22]Roth, Person and Community "NY: Fordham University Press, 1975), p. 88.

[23]Jo Ann Boydston, Guide to the Works of John Dewey (Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press, 1970), p. 22.

[24]Ibid.

[25]Paul Arthur Schilpp (editor), The Philosophy of John Dewey (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1939), p. 398. This chapter, #13, was written by Edward L. Schaub.

[26]Assuming that one interpretation of "supernaturalism" is to the effect that Jesus was the Christ--and that He and God were of the same substance--there probably are individuals in SWPES and related organizations who subscribe to this kind of "supernaturalism" while at the same time they are social-political liberals. Okay and okay! However, the assignment I gave myself has been to have a look at Bill Drake as a religious person--and my assumption is that he would have been with Dewey in rejecting supernaturalism.

[27]I include in this note a reference to what I have previously implied: That this paper is really introductory in nature. Whether a biography of Bill is needed inasmuch as Jack Willers has edited a full-fledged autobiography, is debatable. More to the point, I believe that it isn't debatable as to whether the final lines of a statement of this kind should be consistent with Drake's approach to religion--for they should be.

INFERENCES FROM STUDIES ABOUT THE CONTRADICTORY ROLE OF ADULT EDUCATION IN THE UNIVERSITY

Henry R. Weinstock
University of Missouri-St. Louis

The status of Adult Education as a university discipline is at issue in graduate programs. The focal point of this issue is the contradiction between the university professorial approach, "This is what will be taught.", and the adult learner's approach, "This is what I choose to learn." The consequences of these differences in turn have serious repercussions for programs in Adult Education. These effects may manifest themselves in a variety of ways, including in the number and frequency of courses offered, the academic status granted these courses by the university, and the presence of doctoral programs in Adult Education.

So far I have been involved in seven studies about the contradictions between the professorial and adult learner's approaches, four of these being undertaken with my colleague, John A. Henschke. It should be noted that, for the sake of continuity, today's paper includes a brief description of the first five studies. A more extensive discussion of these appear in my 1991 presentation published in the Proceedings of the Forty-Second Annual Meeting Southwestern Philosophy of Education Society.[1] Taken in toto, the other six studies each involved presentations at conferences in and related to Adult Education. Where permitted, participation by selected groups at the conferences had been encouraged.

The Seven Studies

The first study was entitled "Adult Education and the Valuing of Knowledge in the University."[2] It dealt with (1) the presentation of four models about the valuing of knowledge in the university and (2) the analysis by Adult Education participants about the meaning of the "intrinsic" and "instrumental" valuing of knowledge.

The second study was "Adult Education as a Discipline in the University."[3] This was a continuation of the analysis of the inherent differences between Adult Education and the university, thus making it a somewhat dubious candidate for acceptance as a discipline. Particular questions were raised about Adult Education and subject matter, research, graduate study, and secondary education.

The third study was "Adult Education as a Conjoint Academic and Practitioner Enterprise."[4] This was the first of three enabling Adult Education participants to analyze logical contradictions between the professorial and adult learner's approaches. This involved a clarification of six sets of contradictory paired terms and some common terms associated with the two approaches.

The fourth study was "An Analysis of University Concepts at Issue Between Traditional and Adult Education."[5] Here, a review and analysis of each of the six sets of contradictory pairs of terms previously explicated was undertaken by separate groups of Adult Education participants.

The fifth study was "University Concepts Common to Traditional and Adult Education."[6] After a brief review of the previously explicated six pairs of contradictory terms, Adult Education participants this time analyzed those terms common to the professorial and adult learner's approaches.

The sixth study was "Contradictory and Common Concepts about Adult Education in the University".[7] This was the earlier cited summary of the first five studies presented at the 1991 meeting of the Southwestern Philosophy of Education Society. A major consideration for Adult Education growing out of it was that the university professor is predominantly a "learning facilitator" who can help the "adult" college student get the most out of each course.

The seventh and final study was "Traditional University Concepts and the Justification of Graduate Programs in Adult Education."[8] After a review of the previous six studies, participant discussion was undertaken here in regard to four inferences. These were that Adult Education courses have (1) instructor, not student, determined grading standards; (2) a theory-based, logically consistent body of knowledge; (3) student requirements situated within a framework of specific course content; and (4) scholarly graduate research which is consistent with the field of Education.[9]

Inferences about Adult Education

In light of the seven studies cited here, several inferences may be made about the contradictory role of the field of Adult Education in higher education, in general, and in the university, in particular. The chief one of these concerns apparent irreconcilable differences between the traditional professorial role described by "this is what is to be taught" and the adult educator's dictum of "this is what I choose to learn." This issue becomes especially pointed when the critics of Adult Education aver, however, that a student cannot do whatever he or she wishes, yet expect the university to concurrently award a degree for doing so. The critics therefore conclude that, in the final analysis, the cohesiveness and integrity of an acknowledged discipline would expect the professors of that discipline to be the judges of whether relevant knowledge has actually been acquired by the student.

On the other hand, the presence of a variety of fields of study in some universities, yet not in others, attests to the fact that there is no consensus as to the epistemological question of just what truth and knowledge are nor the axiological question of which knowledge is of most worth. Examples of fields often not found in many universities abound. These include archeology, theology, architecture, chiropractic medicine, administration of justice, women's studies, and astronomy, among a myriad of others. Perceived in this light, it seems that viewing the education of adults as a specific broad group

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

upon which to focus university scholarship would be no more general in breadth than the traditional scholarly focus upon some other disciplines. Interestingly enough, these seem to include history (knowing all about what has happened), journalism (knowing all about what is happening), philosophy (knowing all about what should happen), or education (knowing all about how to teach anything). In other words, the selection and treatment of broad areas or groups under the aegis of scholarly method may be virtually limitless. What is more, this logically would not be limited by the traditional university boundaries imposed by colleges of arts and sciences, professional schools, and schools of education.

Conclusions

It seems that there is little reason to object to the education of adults being an emphasis area in its own right. What is more, this would be analogous to all other sub-disciplines in the field of Education. In light of the series of studies about Adult Education cited here, it seems likely that the specific and intensive study of the education of adults might in itself have already assumed the status of a sub-discipline of Education in its own right. If this be the case, then the long-standing issue of whether Education in itself is a discipline also comes to the forefront. This becomes especially argumentative when perceived in terms of at least one traditional set of alternative views about it, namely, (1) that Education is a discipline, (2) that Education could be a discipline, or (3) that Education is not now and can never be a discipline.[10]

References

[1]Weinstock, Henry R., "Contradictory and Common Concepts about Adult Education in the University," Proceedings of the Forty-Second Annual Meeting Southewestern Philosophy of Education Society, 42:19-22,1992.

[2]Weinstock, Henry R., "Adult Education and the Valuing of Knowledge in the University," Missouri Association for Adult Continuing and Community Education, 1989 Annual Conference, Kansas City, MO, March 9, 1989.

[3]Weinstock, Henry R., "Adult Education as a Discipline in the University," The Eighth Annual Midwest Research-to-Practice Conference in Adult Continuing and Community Education, University of Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, MO, October 12, 1989. The paper was later published in the conference Proceedings, 215-221, 1989.

[4]Weinstock, Henry R. and Henschke, John A., "Adult Education as a Conjoint Academic and Practitioner Enterprise," Missouri Association for Adult Continuing and Community Education, 1990 Annual Conference, Osage Beach, MO, March 8, 1990.

[5]Weinstock, Henry R. and Henschke, John A., "An Analysis of University Concepts at Issue Between Traditional and Adult Education," Missouri Association for Adult Continuing and Community Education, 1991 Annual Conference, St. Louis, MO, March 7, 1991.

[6]Weinstock, Henry R. and Henschke, John A., "University Concepts Common to Traditional and Adult Education," Missouri Valley Adult Education Association, 47th Annual Conference, Overland Park, KS, April 11, 1991. A synopsis was later published in the conference Post Conference Journal, pp. 62-63, 1991.

[7]Loc. cit., Proceedings of the Forty-Second Annual Meeting of the Southwestern Philosophy of Education Society.

[8]Weinstock, Henry R. and Henschke, John A.,"Traditional University Concepts and the Justification of Graduate Programs in Adult Education," Missouri Valley Adult Education Association, 49th Annual Conference, Minneapolis, MN, April 30, 1993.

[9]Ibid., (program) Concurrent Sessions G.3., p.19.

[10]Soltis, Jonas F., An Introduction to the Analysis of Educational Concepts (second edition), Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Company, pp. 22-30, 1978.

CRITICAL PEDAGOGY, LIBERALISM, AND DEWEY

David Snelgrove
Oklahoma City Schools

There has, of late, been a resurgence of interest in pragmatic and neo-pragmatic philosophy and their relationship to leftist educational thought, especially the Critical Theory based schools of virtually every social science. Among the possible reasons for this renascence are the work of Jurgen Habermas, the impact of the thought of Richard Rorty, Willard Van Orman Quine and others who can be easily placed in the pragmatic tradition, and, quite frankly, the conservative hegemony of American education and society throughout the 1980s to which this left critique has been a response.

But, there are some issues to be resolved. Much of the radical critique has been expressed not only in terms of a criticism of the conservative period in which we now find ourselves, but also of the tradition of liberalism upon which this society is, after all, based. As if the rise of the conservative political, economic, and social ideologies is somehow a failure of the liberal tradition in general. And what is the effect of pragmatism especially as it is applied to society through progressive education and, dare we say, reconstructionism, if it is not liberal.

Another issue is John Dewey. Dewey was such an important historical and philosophical figure that many radical and critical theorists seem to feel that Dewey must be included, at least in some part of their critique or discussion. Not unlike scholarly work in Soviet times tha-t seemed to always include references to the work of Lenin, Marx, and Engels. Of course, that would be nothing new to Dewey whose name and work were often cited, sometimes to his chagrin, to support or receive the blame for a wide range of educational behaviors and ideas. Arthur Wirth wrote in 1959 that, "John Dewey was frequently ... (made) responsible in some devious way for the shortcomings of American schools."[1] Wirth was, I think, referring to the conservative, essentialist critique of American education, a critique that is, of course, still with us. But the same could be said of the radical left critique of American education and the ideals of liberal society in general. Only in the past couple of years has there been a recognition of the value of the social thought of Dewey and the other pragmatists as well in the analysis of modern society. For example, Sam Stack provided us with an illuminating analysis of the influence of Dewey on the work of Jurgen Habermas.[2]

This paper is an effort to place the critical theorists' views of Dewey and his work in perspective. I will deal first with the development of Critical Theory.

Critical theory springs from the writings of Marx to expose social inequities and injustices among the institutions of society. As Dmitri Shalin writes, "(Marx) set out to investigate what keeps reason from exercising Its curative powers. The main impediment, Marx concluded, was class domination and the institutions, such as law, morality, and philosophy, through which the capitalist state obfuscates its oppression and perpetuates false consciousness among the toiling masses."[3] Critical theory analyzes social efficiency, social control and its attendant behavioristic psychology through class interest and hegemony, and exploitative and repressive aspects of American society.

The major radical Marxist critique of American education dates only from the middle 1970s with the publication of Martin Carnoy's Education as Cultural Imperialism (1974) and Herbert Bowles and Samuel Gintis's Schooling in Capitalist America (1976). Both of these books criticized the liberal social reform that was still to be found at the time of their writing and represent, to a large extent, the source of the discourse of radical and critical educational opposition as opposed to the passionate critics of the 1960s which represented a much more affective and humanistic rhetoric. Much of the radical discourse of the 1980s represents a dialogue with Carnoy, Bowles, and Gintis.

The most vital orientation of Critical Theory is the reconceptualist approach to an understanding of the ideological underpinnings of everyday practices and problems with a commitment to act on Marx's Eleventh Thesis on Feuerbach and "change the world."[4] Critical theory has made an effort to move beyond the reproductive and deterministic economic ties of the earlier radical and Marxist theories, and built on the results of those critiques. But there are inherent in such developmental processes and radical analyses some aspects that need to be more completely explored and understood.

One important aspect that I might mention has to do with the analysis of the orthodox and neo-Marxist paradigms in light of contemporary social and economic conditions. Among these analyses, the analogy of the orthodox Marxist view of reproductive schooling to a form of "black box" has gained popularity, suggesting that schooling, as a reproductive endeavor, is little more than a process of imposition of the norms and behaviors that exist in the world of the worker, ignoring the environment of cultural conflict and social tensions that exist within schools and which serve to render a wide range of educational products far from the predetermined ideals.

Henry A. Giroux, Michael Apple, Stanley Aronowitz, to mention only a few, find that the orthodox and neo-Marxist critique is too limiting and too hopeless. According to their thinking, if an education only serves the purpose of reproducing the economic relations of society and is linked in absolute correspondence with those economic relations, then there is no opportunity for intervention unless and until the economic environment is changed. Such change can best be accomplished through the process of schooling. In avoiding what they perceive to be a kind of chicken-and-egg problem, they are forced to reject any idea of total ideological domination. George H. Wood writes, "Giroux demonstrates that ideology does not spring from an economic base in totality, complete and without contradiction. Rather such ideological structures are replete with contradictions fractured and splintered and at times inherently oppositional."[5] Similarly, the relationships of base and superstructure which under orthodox and neo-Marxism are linked by the dominance of the cultural and social institutions by the capitalists who control the

economic base are also a source and a site of the ideological struggle. While these relationships do include dominance, they also exert strong influences on each other.[6]

The critical theorists see themselves as even more radical., yet qualitatively different from the Marxist while still heirs to selected Marxist traditions. What they seem to offer is the opportunity for a "praxis" movement beyond the current limits of educational reform through an exposure of the interrelatedness and functioning of the ideology, hegemony, and culture of capitalist society. In effect, ideology becomes a manifestation of hegemony perpetuating the notion that the common good is best served through the dominance of capitalism. Giroux suggests that a "theory of radical pedagogy take as its central task an analysis of how both hegemony functions in schools and how various forms of resistance and opposition either challenge or help sustain it."[7]

Education as an institution is at the mercy of not only the political system that never provides enough of the resources that would be required to do any more than a barely adequate job; the publishing companies who, in the quest for profits expand but moderate the curriculum and learning materials leaving teachers largely out of the equation; the culture that seems to value almost any kind of activity, over the intellectual; and the economy which in the process of de-industrialization is being forced to revise and expand the ideas about the relationships of the world of work while redefining the idea of social mobility to make downward mobility socially acceptable.

The relationship between Critical Theory and John Dewey is very complex. Pragmatism and Marxism of which Critical Theory is a revision are, after all, both the creations of young Hegelians. Dewey a young Hegelian? Yes, Jurgen Habermas coined the term "the radical-democratic branch of Young Hegelianism to frame the pragmatism espoused by Dewey and Mead."[8] Oscar Handlin wrote that, "Dewey's commitment to Hegelian idealism nurtured his hostility to dualisms of every sort and left him dubious as to the validity of all such dichotomies as those between education or culture and society or life."[9] Bill Fisher's Drake Lecture in this volume touches on some of these very issues.

Still another aspect of the problematic relationship between Critical Theory and John Dewey is characterized by the generally condescending attitude of the Critical Theorists toward pragmatism. The common belief among many European philosophers, especially the Germans was that pragmatism was simply a philosophy of capitalist society and most critical theorists themselves more in the European tradition. Part of the problem of the antagonism between critical theory and pragmatism is the basic theoretical assumptions brought by the members of the Frankfurt School when they emigrated during a period of what they perceived to be capitalism run amok. These assumptions were characterized by Hans Joas in Pragmatism and Social Theory as follows: liberal capitalism found itself ostensibly in an inexorable process of transition into monopolistic and state-regulated forms. They contended that as a result, the liberal state was becoming transformed into its authoritarian counterpart and laws of a general nature were becoming subject to functional change and increasingly replaced by special regulations. These processes were accompanied by both the destruction of the conditions for true individuation and the increasing disintegration of all high culture in favor of commercial or propagandistic mass culture. Cultural and psychological changes were interpreted as functional for the political and economic centralization of domination. Social research became instrumental contract research, philosophy nothing but a positivistic reduction of all questions to methodology; social psychology promoted conformism; and mass culture represented decay and loss of the transcending powers of European high culture."[10]

There is also a negative assumption that American thought is almost exclusively utilitarian and empirical. But pragmatist philosophy initiated the revolt against formalism in the United States as a point of departure for a new understanding of the solutions to cognitive and moral problems. Horkheimer in several of his essays and in The Eclipse of Reason views pragmatism as a philosophy that reduces human life to labor and is wholly inadequate for spiritual, aesthetic, and personal investigation. This conclusion is reached through a dualistic distinction between subjective and objective reasons. Subjective or instrumental reasón has in pragmatist thought destroyed objective reason, the knowledge of humankind's higher temporal goods.[11]

The Frankfurt School's interpretations came from a Marxist understanding of liberalism and democracy as superstructural components of capitalism. The development of monopoly capitalism was to be accompanied by the necessary emergence of the totalitarian state and that liberalism engendered the total-authoritarian state with all the elements of liberal democracy, such as freedom of speech and of the press and of publicity, tolerance, parliamentarianism, and the division of powers are expressly reduced to being functional components of competition capitalism.[12]

Other Western approaches to Marxism having little or no contact with the Frankfurt School have also taken the increasingly vague label Critical Theory from which has evolved critical sociology, critical jurisprudence, critical pedagogy, critical feminism, etc. The elevation of critical theory has kept the focus on European modes of thought instead of drawing on equally valid American traditions. It was only a matter of time until someone suggested "Critical Pragmatism,".

The inability of Critical Theory of the Frankfurt School to do conceptual justice to the analysis of the economic and social crises of the 1930s, equating liberalism and democracy with utilitarianism detracts from the social tensions that have traditionally existed between them. Agrarian populism, progressive social reformative tendencies, the New Deal, etc. all point out the will of the society to mobilize for change. Dewey's political thought proceeded precisely from such processes of collective action, not form the state. Such action encounters problems and has unintended or unanticipated consequences which must be processed in their turn. Dewey's political program is aimed at recreating the endangered democratic public sphere by revitalizing community life even in the large cities, by preventing the development of expertocracy, by making the public sphere responsible for the host of unintended consequences industrial society produces, and by means of the publicity and freedom of research in the social sciences. By equating capitalism with democracy and liberalism, Critical Theory of any school eliminates an important theoretical theme in the analysis of social development.[13]

Dewey has also been castigated by the critical

theorists for failing to engage in a more impassioned analysis of the social, political, and economic forces that mitigate against the causes of democracy, as being unrealistically optimistic about using the agency of the school for the amelioration of society, and as failing to understand fully the class and culture struggles that mark the school experience. Dewey's philosophy and curriculum theory yield, they say, to the realities of adjustment rather than resistance. Dewey's faith in the reconstruction of the school and society is viewed as an apolitical and conserving activity. While these "negative facets" of Dewey's work are perceived to be dialectical tensions, some critical theorists, in an effort to have their work viewed in the context of Dewey's and to bring the work of Dewey to bear on the ideological struggle, extract the "radical" elements out of Dewey's writings scarcely acknowledging those elements with which they would be unable to agree. Such schisms, however, cannot be passed over since significantly consistent and thematic elements of Dewey's work are implicated, especially a certain amount of instrumentalism.[14]

In Experience and Education, Dewey noted his wariness of ideology, fearing that it would lead to a "movement that thinks, and acts in terms of an 'ism" and eventually becomes so involved in reaction against other 'isms that it is unwittingly controlled by them."[15] But he also noted that,

> All social movements involve conflicts which are reflected intellectually in controversies... It is the business of an intelligent theory of education to ascertain the causes for the conflicts that exist and then, instead of taking one side or the other, to indicate a plan of operation ... This formulation of the business of the philosophy does not mean that the latter should attempt to bring about a compromise between opposed schools of thought, to find a via media, nor yet make an eclectic combination of points picked out hither and yon from all schools. It means the necessity of the Introduction of a new order of conceptions leading to new modes of practice.[16]

If Dewey was wary of ideology, he had a great respect for the struggle for the 'new order.' He treated problems of education not from an abstract, previously defined position of what ought ideally to be, but rather from a concrete estimate of deficiencies that actually existed. The necessity for grappling with a development that had divorced the school and its culture from society and its life was an irritant that forced Dewey to define his ideas on education. Those ideas were integrally related to his comprehensive conceptions of the character of knowledge, the mind, human nature, the experimental process, and the values of democracy. The crucial test was the extent to which education served as a vital instrument through which the individual learned to behave in the world about him.

Words and concepts like power relations, empowerment, liberation, voice, authority, emancipation, transformation, and discourse all denote the struggle to change schooling. The problem with critical pedagogy is that it offers very few substantive ideas on how to put into practice what it offers. Elizabeth Ellsworth describes some of the difficulties of putting critical pedagogy into practice, concluding that, "... what has become more frightening than the unknown or unknowable, are social, political, and educational projects that predicate and legitimate their actions of the kind of knowing that underlies current definitions of critical pedagogy. In this sense, current understandings and uses of 'critical,' 'empowerment,' 'student voice ' I and 'dialogue' are only surface manifestations of deeper contradictions involving pedagogics both traditional and critical."[17]

Critical theory focuses on the role of power relations as they exist in society. As it relates to the school, it takes the form of a type of liberation pedagogy. "The term 'critical pedagogy,' like other labels, implies a more static and bounded category than is in fact the case. ...(A) wide range of perspectives has come to be included under the broad rubric of critical pedagogy, but all of the work described as critical pedagogy shares a stance of critique and an interpretation of pedagogy in its wider sense as including curriculum, social relationships in the classroom, and the ways in which the classroom reflects the larger social context.[18]

Among the concrete proposals and recommendations made for schools by critical pedagogues are those that are closely related to the types of school activities found in the recommendations of the Progressives of the 1930s and 1940s. James E. McClellan in his 1989 Drake lecture suggested, "An educational program is to be rated Progressive in proportion to its satisfaction of three criteria: (i) it is directed toward the fullest self-development of each young person entrusted to its care, (ii) it is fully social--i.e., organized into activities that require and teach skills of cooperative effort and democratic decision-making, (iii) it is permeates throughout with the faith and practice of scientific inquiry."[19] Such suggestions as project method, child centeredness, relevance to the day-to-day lives of students, democratic classroom techniques, and the development of practical skills are nowadays termed "postmodern." Aronowitz and Giroux write, " ... the postmodern temperament arises from the exhaustion of the still prevailing intellectual and artistic knowledge and the crisis of the institutions charged with their production and transmission-- the schools. Critical postmodernism provides a political and pedagogical basis not only for challenging current forms of academic hegemony, but also for deconstructing conservative forms ... At its best, a critical postmodernism signals the possibility for not only rethinking the issue of educational reform but also creating a pedagogical discourse that deepens the most radical impulses and social practices of democracy itself."[20] "Postmodern educational criticism insists on the intellectual equality of marginal discourses --feminism, sexuality, race, class--with those in which these discourses are occluded, when considered at all."[21]

Dewey and pragmatism might not contain a remedy for improving contemporary mass society. There is no promise that all the varied and complex problems that exist in critical theory can be alleviated through the increased application of pragmatic thought. But it is now clear that there is a growing interest in pragmatism and in incorporating some aspects of pragmatism into radical social theory.

I believe that critical theory and pragmatism need each other. Critical theory can provide the macro analysis we need to understand the myriad of social and economic relations that make up this culture and provide the radical political agenda for the reconstruction of the

society. But critical theory has not been able to provide the practical educational strategies that would be applicable to the teachers and students in the schools, colleges, and universities. Pragmatic thought could provide a more suitable basis for designing instruction for this new social order. Critical pragmatism? Or Pragmatic Critical Theory? Why not?

ENDNOTES

1. Arthur Wirth, "Foreword," in Oscar Handlin, John Dewey's Challenge to Education (New York: Harper Brothers, 1959), p. 6.

2. Sam Stack, "Jurgen Habermas and John Dewey: Toward-- a Theory of Social Democracy," in Journal of Educational Philosophy and History, 1993, pp. 86-88.

3. Dmitri N. Shalin, "Critical Theory and the Pragmatist Challenge," American Journal of Sociology Vol. 98, No. 2, p. 238.

4. Peter S. Hlebowitsh, "Critical Theory Versus Curriculum Theory: Reconsidering the Dialogue on Dewey," Educational Theory, Winter 1992, vol. 42, no. 1. p. 69.

5. George H. Wood, "Beyond Radical Educational Cynicism," Educational Theory, vol. 32, no. 2, p. 64.

6. For a discussion of the orthodox-Marxist position on these relationships, see: M. Shirokov, dir., Textbook of Marxist Philosophy, A. C. Mosely, translator, revised and edited by John Lewis, Chicago: Proletarian Publishers, pp. 162-176.

7. Henry A. Giroux, Ideology, Culture, and the Process of Schooling, Philadelphia: Temple University Press, p. 26 .

8. Ibid., p. 246.

9. Oscar Handlin, John Dewey's Challenge to Education (New York: Harper Brothers, 1959), p. 40.

10. Hans Joas, Pragmatism and Social Theory (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1993).

11. Ibid., pp. 81-82.

12. Ibid. p. 84.

13. Ibid. pp. 85-86.

14. Hlebowitsh, Critical Theory..., p. 72.

15. John Dewey, Experience & Education (New York: Collier Books, 1971), p. 6.

16. Ibid., p. 5.

17. Elizabeth Ellsworth, "Why Doesn't This Feel Empowering?" Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 59, No. 3, p. 320.

18. Kathleen Weiler and Candace Mitchell, editors, What Schools Can Do (New York: SUNY Press, 1992), p. 3.

19. James E. McClellan, Jr., "Our Historical Duty," Proceedings of the Southwestern Philosophy of Education Society, Volume XXXIX, 1989, p. 13.

20. Stanley Aronowitz and Henry A. Giroux, Postmodern Education, Politics, Culture, and Social Criticism, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1991, p.187.

21. Ibid., p. 186.

THE PRIVATIZATION OF SCHOOLS AND THE GENERAL WELFARE

Richard J. Elliott and Carol S. Stack
University of New Orleans

It has been reasoned and argued in the past by leaders in and outside of education that public education in our society should be grounded in the spirit and tenets of democracy. As a moral and social philosophy democracy is a profound belief in the dignity of individuals and in the worth of the human personality. As a political process, democracy goes beyond abstraction to imply that all social institutions be organized to permit and facilitate full development of every person. Thomas Jefferson insisted that the first business of government is to promote the welfare of the common people. The view of human nature changed during the latter part of the 19th century from one that holds that an individual's human nature is predetermined to one that looks at an individual as an inherently social being nourished and shaped by culture forces. Public schools aided in the acculturation of individuals. This new view of human nature was never disputed or of major concern to most as long as there was an agreed upon value system which was being transmitted to the students. There was no structural problems as to public schools doing this except through conservative forces who disliked having to pay taxes for a public school system. However, there is now wide disagreement over values and which values are being taught. The formation of reactive institutions whose members express concern over emergent and different values and the nature of a Darwinian view of being itself. Reacting against a Darwinian view of human nature, by not looking at human nature as essentially social, but human nature as something apart from and prior to membership in the social group, fully possessed of personality and endowed with rights not subject to social regulation necessitates a view which looks at schools quite differently. This historically old view of natural law places schools and other social institutions in a secondary and/or contractual mode of existence. This view is now present in discourse that expresses itself in terms of the privatization of many essential social services, one of which is the public school. Because of the amount of discourse on this view, it is our contention that an erosion of a necessary sense of the general welfare, essential to the ongoing nature of our society, is widespread. This contention comes from our observations of both written and verbal discourse, internal and external, on education. Professional and non professional discourse on education reflects values which are largely narcissistic, and void of an understanding of our historical and cultural tradition. It is evident that there is a failure of the schools to produce the free-thinking citizen that a democracy demands. This is in part due to the failure of teachers as leaders in the community to engage in critical discourse on the major issues of the day. Our schools have been transformed from institutions who educate citizens to function critically in a democracy to institutions who train students for the market place.

At this time in our history, any discourse that may result in some meaningful dialogue of public philosophy is almost beside the point. Indeed, at the national level, we now perceive schools as radically different than a reasonable reading of history would teach us. The national goals illustrate so well the absence of a public function for education. Recent national political platforms advocating school choice financed vouchers for students attending non public schools reveal the extent that national leaders look to the private sector to place the important business of educating the youth. There seems to be no concern by major political parties to the fact that the institution of education may be too important of an institution to leave to private or religious interests. From the national political level, private and religious interest have produced a discourse that reflects a gross distortion of education both as to knowledge and history of education and its purposes.

Tragically leaders inside and outside of education have failed to address these distortions and have through this neglect endangered the general welfare. A reading of classical Greek history and American history give us quite a different notion of who should be the responsible agent of education. We know that this is not the first time in history that education, character, virtue and political stability have been discussed. Plato, in The Republic Book IV wrote ". . . where good nurture and education are maintained, they implant good constitutions, and these good constitutions taking root in a good education improve, more and more. . ."[1] Aristotle in Politics, Book VIII, viewing the relationship between the state and education stated more directly than Plato this relationship:

> . . . . No one will doubt that the legislator should direct his attention above all to the education of youth; for the neglect of education does harm to the constitution. The citizens should be molded to suit the form of government under which he lives. For each government has a peculiar character which it originally formed and which continues to preserve it. The character of democracy creates democracy and to character of oligarchy creates oligarchy, and always the better the character, the better the government.[2]

Aristotle's position as well as Plato's position hold that the state has central concern as to the nature of education and the consequences of education—the better the education of each citizen, the better the government. As we can see, tying the fabric of education to the fabric of the state to ensure the security of the state, is not a new idea. This view prevailed into the early beginnings of colonial times and does not significantly change until the twentieth century.

> It being one chief project of (the old delude) Satan to keep men from the knowledge of the scripture, and in former times keeping them in unknown tongues, so in these latter times by persuading

from the use of tongues, that so at least the true sense and meaning of the original might be clouded and corrupted with false glosses of deceivers; to the end that learning may not be buried in the graves of our forefathers, in church and commonwealth, the Lord assisting our endeavors...3

For Puritans, ignorance was dangerous and knowledge of the Bible was essential for salvation and the continuance of the religious state. The Puritans viewed the good as other worldly. Puritans were still somewhat feudal-minded Medievalist in their religion, economy, and politics. Their social values were dogmatic, regulated and disciplined; not democratic, secular, and inquiring. In this regard they left the Greek tradition. Today, the distortion of our cultural heritage by current religious leaders as well as by political leaders, asserting that our religious tradition was freedom loving is simply wrong. Our teachers seem to be ignorant of this. The Puritans basic intolerance was expressed not only in their religious dogmatism, but in their treatment of Roger Williams. However, Massachusetts Bay Colony's loss was Rhode Island's gain. Social aristocracy and devotion to church-state alliance does not serve democratic ideals. In Massachusetts Bay Colony the Puritan church was using colonial schools for its own purposes.

Out of the American Revolution and the intellectual tradition springing from the Age of Reason and the Enlightenment came stark contrast to the thoughts of Puritans. Franklin and Jefferson's ideas would change substantially the relationship to church and state and their ideas argue the necessity of education to preserve this new society. They viewed education as a necessary function to mold character and personality which would enable citizens to participate effectively in their society. Education viewed in this fashion means that schools ultimately have a moral and political function as well as an intellectual function. This Franklin and Jefferson knew so well that one might reasonably infer that this view looks to educators as the vicars of society. Therefore teachers derive their authority from the society they serve, not from religious or private interests. This analysis implies that the authority of the teacher rests on the basic intellectual and moral commitments of the society served.

In our country, these commitments rest on impressive evidence of the democratic tradition which embodies the social faith of the nation. These principles are stated in the Declaration of Independence. Almost without exception, philosophers, scholars, and historians world wide describe these principles as American ideals and doctrines of democracy. It is our myth, the General Welfare, the profound belief in the dignity of man and in the human personality that is now in danger of being eroded. Conflict exists between those who would use government to promote economic and social welfare for the masses and those that insist that the public is best served by private and parochial interest is now present at all levels of society. This argument occurred in the 1870s and 1880s. Educators need a foundational educational background to place more securely the democratic notions of education, the crucial role of a public supported school system to the preservation of democratic principles, and how our schools came to be.

It was late in the nineteenth century that the argument focused sharply on public support for a non religious public school system and public support for religious schools. Centering around a great deal of political activity for federal support of public education in the 1870s and 1880s with the Hoar and Blair proposal for federal participation and federal support of public education, religious groups argued that it was their domain and not the state to educate. Largely, the Roman Catholic church, while not opposing universal education, would object to the state carrying it out. The Roman Catholic Church believed that a public educational system was really designed to destroy their church. In 1887 a Jesuit priest wrote in the American Catholic Quarterly Review "that the only educational taxes that can be reasonably defended are those which go to the support of orphans and helpless children".4 This is a remarkable statement when considered along side Jefferson's view. In 1904 in the Catholic World, Vol. 79, September, 1904 further argument was made against public education. "It is beyond question, the exclusive right and duty of the parent to provide his children with all those aids which are necessary to their physical, intellectual, and moral life—subject to the special right and duty of the church to add thereto a training in Christian faith."5

Implied in the above statements is that an individual apart from and prior to an individual's membership in a society, an individual's membership belongs first to a natural state, the family, and then to an eternal state, the church. That these two states have prior rights as to education goes without saying. The crux of the church's argument erodes the notion of the general welfare, or common good. Society is viewed as a mere collection of individuals having no common social interests but only private or religious interests. The Roman Catholic point of view stands in sharp contrast to the Greek philosophers as well as those of our constitutional framers which established an enlightened secular basis for education which would be the best guarantee to our social, moral and political state.

In 1870s the position of the Roman Catholic church regarding education was stated clearly by the chief justice of the Supreme Court of Arizona, when speaking on behalf of a group of Roman Catholics in that state: "We that is, those for whom I now argue maintain—first—that the state has no right to teach religion, Second, that the state has no right to teach irreligion, third, that the state has no inherent right to teach at all."6

In the historical sense, what members of the Roman Catholic Church were stating was similar to the view of the Puritan church in Massachusetts Bay Colony which essentially controlled the basic tenets

of the curriculum in these schools. Reverting to this patterning of thinking that dominated the Puritan era by asserting that the church was the essential institution for education, a lack of the ethical sense of the larger community by the splintering education along religious or private spheres is accomplished. Indeed, the solution to public education for the Roman Catholics was that one single public school system was not sufficient but that several public school systems would be the way to go. Compulsory attendance would be acceptable under this scheme. A statement in the Catholic World "On our part, we are willing to be taxed for unreligious schools for the children of unreligious parents, if such parents are willing on their part to be taxed for religious schools for our children."7

One can speculate if public education were to

have taken this route, whether Dewey's observation on the dividend of the public schools providing a sense of community would have been made. The General Good is diminished, unity and a sense of community is broken, whether by greed, ignorance or religious self interest, the welfare of the state is eroded. To argue that moral education can best be developed in the private or religious community is to look at morals in education as essentially lessons about morals or catechetical instruction. In this sense a "supreme court" which has settled much of the moral questions exist, and we need only to acquire knowledge about this existence. Thus, the good life is separate and apart from the common good and not connected to environments of differences. We do not have to go too far into our history to realize that special groups can lead to pathological teachings.

For Dewey all value emanates from shared associations and democracy was and is the clear consciousness of community, in all its various meanings. Democracy is a way of life that values the individual, not an individualistic conception in the sense of every individual for himself. Rather, democracy has it being in and through communal association.

> Regarded as an idea, **democracy** is not an alternative to other principles of associated life, it is the idea of community life itself. The clear consciousness of a communal life in all its implications, constitutes the idea of democracy. . . . . **Liberty** is the secure release and fulfillment of personal potentialities which take place only in rich and manifold association with others: the power to be and individualized self making a distinctive contribution and enjoying in its own way the fruits of association. . . . **Equality** . . . denotes effective regard for whatever is distinctive and unique in each, irrespective of physical and psychological inequalities. It is not a natural possession but is a fruit of the community when its action is directed by its character as a community.8

The public schools are the institutions which prepared citizens for the special requirements to function critically in a democracy. The security and continuance of a public school system is the best possible vehicle by which the state can continue its democratic existence.

> A society which makes provision for participating in its good of all its members on equal terms and which secures flexible readjustment of its institutions through interaction of the different forms of associated life is in so far democratic. Such a society must have a type of education which gives individuals a personal interest in social relationships and control, and the habits of mind which secure social changes without introducing disorder.9

It matters not whether technology has raised havoc with basic principles and rules from previous generations; arguments remain as to whether values are fixed or relative, social or ideal, everlasting or changing, natural or nonnatural, and/or a host of other values that for many enhance or diminish one's sensibilities. For Dewey, the ideal place for children to discuss these values was and is the common school. In spite of the swirling forces and changes stemming from technological changes and immigration, strong evidence is to be found for a basic core value system within our culture. This we call the democratic tradition and stems from the "Bill of Rights" of the United States Constitution. It is asserted that this core value system has been and can continue to be taught in the schools. It is further asserted that because of our public school system that this core value system has been internalized by most living Americans and gives citizens a basic reference in life. This tradition we call the "Democratic Tradition." It is now argued that to prepare children for effective living in our society, involves the socializing of children to this tradition. The schools are the agency responsible for this task.

However, no value system can be seen as something different than the practical situation. As previously stated, the democratic tradition which represents our basic value system stems from the "Bill of Rights" of the United States Constitution. These "Rights" imply an educational procedure not only quite different from the purposes of Greek classical society, and early colonial education but a modification of many of the practices that go on in today's education. Even the modern state has serious problems over differences of value. This is especially so in complex multicultural societies. Our own society has been embroiled in controversy on a host of values. The amount of social unrest, and social protest is the consequence of such changes. For whatever reasons individuals have historically desired their children to be educated, the state's purpose to educate has been and continues to be one of social necessity. This implies social consensus. There is a continuing mandate for schools to maintain and continue a broad social consensus.

It will be tragic if at a very crucial time in our history, that the schools look at the education of their children in the private sphere. When we tie essential services to the private inclinations of profit or religious interest many loose out. Exclusionary provisions prevail in the private sector. We have privatized our health insurance system and over 35 million citizens are uncovered by health insurance. Private and/or religious interest cannot nor should they be expected to provide for the general welfare. Neither by historical tradition, nor by basic beliefs within the private community does the private or the religious view look to the general welfare. It is here that the state must not abandoned the intent of our early founding fathers and their thoughts on the necessity of a public education as necessary for the preservation of a democratic society. Our country has managed to provide a free public educational system open to all and it does need vast improvement. But to dismantle our public educational system or turn it over to the private or religious sector, under the guise of vouchers, is to not fully understand our history and to place in danger our commitment to the general welfare.

NOTES

1. Plato, The Dialogues of Plato, 4th ED., Trans. by Benjamin Jowett, Oxford, The Clarendon Press, 1953, Vol. II pp. 209-407.

2. Aristotle. Politics, Book VIII (from The Basic

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Works of Aristotle, New York: Random House, IN, 1941).

3. The Charter and General Laws of the Colony and Province of Massachusetts Bay (Boston: T. B. Waite and Co., 1814), p. 186.

4. Bayma, P. "The Liberalistic View of the Public School Question," American Catholic Quarterly Review, Vol. II (1877), pp. 1-29 and 240-270.

5. Woodlock, T. F. "American Principles Versus Secular Education," Catholic World, Vol. 79 (1904), pp. 711-718.

6. Dunne, E. F. Our Public Schools: Are They Free or Are They Not? New York, Thomas Egan, 1875.

7 Elliott, W. "The School Grievance and Its Remedy," Catholic World, Vol. 36 (1882-1883), pp. 713-718.

8. Dewey, J. The Public and Its Problems, Henry Holt and Co. 1927 pp. 148-151.

9. Dewey, J. Democracy and Education (New York: The Free Press, 1966) p. 99.

CHARACTER EDUCATION, VALUES EDUCATION, EQUITY EDUCATION AND POLITICS: A CHALLENGE TO AMERICAN EDUCATORS

Fred D. Kierstead
University of Houston-Clear Lake

"Baseball is ninety percent physical, and the other half is mental."

Yogi Berra

Introduction: Twentieth Century Education

Tragic as it may be to educators in America, Yogi Berra's quips are quoted more than any intellectual we can name. Strong evidence suggests Horatio Alger still lives in our psyche, and Americans still hold to the premise that hard work is the primary way to succeed in America. Maybe Yogi is right. Success relies on the physical realm more than the mental. Education brings us the credentials rather than any intellectual prowess. The industrial era model of education, promoting the division of labor (learning) into an assembly line format, Carnegie units of time, and test results geared toward adaptability of the American worker to industrial and technical needs is still of high priority. Philosophically, we are a conglomeration of efficiency, facts and pragmatic logic that defies consistency and intellectual scrutiny.

Educators have experienced many pendulum swings, from conservative, subject-centered and science-based models in education to more liberal and experienced-based education and back again, seemingly without much upheaval, but this political infighting has taken its toll. American schools have weathered these curricular and leadership shifts over the years, but what has happened most of the time is addition, rather than subtraction. In order to remain "politically correct" in the 20th Century, Americans merely had to ask for the "inclusion" of ideologies, pet projects, and new social issues rather than a substitution.

As a consequence, teachers are now expected to teach about every ill, whim and potential problem suggested along with the curriculum. Even within the curriculum itself, teachers are expected to use the spectrum of educational philosophies and teach for problem solving, scientific investigation, plurality and diversity, time-tested truths, creationism, personal choices, democratic participation and relativity of truth, just to name a few. The inherent dangers of this shotgun approach are a lack of direction and a lack of commitment to any particular ideology. Many of the rationales for our all-inclusive list of goals are mutually exclusive. Inconsistency between theory and practice in teaching is a "given" in the overall educational plan for America.

Our philosophical underpinings are noncommittal, soft and designed to be non-threatening. At the same time, they give us an educational system unable to escape political dalliance.

Relativism" The Result of Politics in Education

One of the most dangerous results of the politicalization of American education is the lack of consensus and a relativism of values and goals. Finger-pointing and scape-goating have become the norm of behavior when discussing America's schools. With the battles over equality of opportunity, what to emphasize in the curriculum, and what to measure on standardized tests, the educational community has lost its voice in decision-making to more powerful lobbies and legislators. Educators are expected to be good "mechanics," who are given the job without a say in its deliberation.[1] Unable to police its own, and powerless to suggest any solutions, the teaching profession has been given the "job" of merely doing what it is told. Rather than developing analytical and evaluative skills in our students for fear of political backlash, we teach what is known.

Add to this mechanistic approach the moral and factual relativism that is the product of educational politics, and we have the foundation of an uncaring, unmotivated and non-participatory youth-culture. Christopher Lasch blames the conservatives for the back to basics thrust that in reality advocates "traditional values" of "consumerism, unskilled labor and advanced technology."[2] He also blames them for not understanding modern capitalism's need for environmental control, the end of planned obsolescence, and a social conscience.[3] Conservatives in his words have ensured competition and a win-lose psychology.

Ron Miller in What Are Schools For? advocates a return to holistic education as the answer to the progressive "mess" of 70 years. He blames liberals in general for producing professionalism in education. This professionalism concentrated on only "mechanisms that make competition more fair" rather than a real concern for humanity in general. Miller believes faith in science, a cult of efficiency and a business mentality in school promoted by progressives and professionals has created an impersonal, mechanistic and less spiritually-oriented society. Miller's advocacy for a holistic (spiritual world view transcending any culture) approach in education, he believes, will free us from science and technical imperatives,[4] and return us to a more human agenda.

Everyone is blaming everyone else for America's inability to prepare "Johnny" and "Jane" for today's world. Not only are children lacking in needed skills and intellect, they are also morally bankrupt. Recent evidence in a 1990 poll found 91% of America's college students have lied or would lie on applications for jobs or for other important reasons, that two thirds admit they cheat on tests, and that 38% of the under-30 population believed being corrupt was essential to getting ahead.[5] Allan Bloom blamed creeping relativism as the culprit, admonishing America for its closed-mindedness and ethnocentric orientation. Unfortunately his call for a liberal education for everybody smacks of yet another form of elitist dogma that was once in vogue, but was

never very successful. R. D. Hirsch has similar ideas with his 4500 items of knowledge needed for cultural literacy, and Edward Wynne had 21 values in his work, Character II. Chester Finn suggests 10 values of cultural conservatism. All of these authors want to fight relativism with a return to time tested standards and principles. Although this approach to values, education, character education and equity education has strong conservative support, it suggests that moral decisions require mere adherence to universal standards, rather than really initiating moral dialogue.

Unlike the aforementioned, Rushworth Kidder suggests 8 global core values that would be accepted by any culture.[6] They are: love (caring), truth (honesty), freedom (liberty), fairness (justice), unity (community), tolerance (diversity), responsibility, and respect for life. Regardless of what culture you come from or what religion you practice, these are Kidder's attempt to reach intersubjective agreement about moral universals.

R. Freeman Butts suggests "twelve tables of civism" that reflect Roman law and most of Aristotle's Laws (in revised form). He calls them "tables" because they are schemata of ideas. Civism (or principles of good citizenship) include justice, human rights, equality, diversity, authority, privacy, due process, property rights, participation, truths and patriotism.[7] Each should be taught in our schools as part of civic responsibility, so says Butts. This author suggests that within civic education are moral precepts and imperatives that must be understood by our citizenry. Although some of these may be learned at home, our schools have had the leadership role in citizenship education all along. Why not use civic education as the foundation for ethical deliberation and ethical conduct?

Legal Precedents for Moral Education in Our Schools

Many argue today that education for good character is not the school's business. Values education is also under fire when viewed as an educational priority. Even though most communities call upon schools to teach citizenship duties and "good" citizenship, in the same breath they fear what values the school will end up teaching. It is ironic that the public does not see the connection between good citizenship and values education, character education and equity education.

There are legal precedents for schools to teach values character and equity education. The Old Deluder Satan Act of 1647 certainly promoted moral education. The Northwest Ordinance of 1787 acknowledged "religion, morality, and knowledge as necessary for good government." In West Virginia State Board of Education v. Barnett (1943), the Supreme Court ruled that public schools are allowed to teach adherence to rules and a regulations, regardless of the students' objections. The 1979 Amback v. Norwick decision, the Court confirmed that schools have the role of promoting "fundamental values necessary to the maintenance of a democratic system." In the 1982 Board of Education v. Pico case, the Court held that schools be the place where community interests and respect for authority and traditional values are learned, "be they social, moral or political." All of these cases, however, miss the point of a truly ethical character. They suppose that morality, justice, honesty and equity can be taught like any other subject. They neglect the need for moral discourse in the determination of such terms.

Bilingual education, multicultural education and ESL programs are all examples of legislation to promote equality of educational opportunity. Civil rights legislation has been in the forefront of social and political life in America, but there are still fears that our schools are promoting permissive practices that have not worked well with minority children. This author suggests that trying to legislate morality is a bit like building a nice path for Sisyphus' giant boulder. Multicultural education should build tolerance, fairness, interdependence and equity, but in fact, it has produced as much seperation, vindictiveness and intolerance. Maybe the reason why this has happened is attributable to the process. Students have to first have a moral sense before they learn about cultural differences. The multicultural experience should unify us rather than create enclaves of special interest.

Moral Accounting

This author suggests that most of the court cases, legislation and political posturing about character, values and equity education have viewed moral/ethical education as merely a set of rules to be followed. Having origins in religion, values, character and equality were manifested in behaviors and rules. "Good" and "bad" children either followed the rules or they didn't. This model worked as long as the students were in school, but did not carry over into life as studies by Hugh Hartshorne and Mark May suggest. Dogmatic approaches have not been the answer. Even John Dewey recognized the need for communal participation and deliberation of values. The argument about character education, values education and equality in education are not new, but what is new is the realization that merely teaching values, behaviors and legislating for equity have not worked.

Then what has worked? Cooperative learning models, promotion of positive classroom climates, and curricula involving discussion of moral dilemma and case studies have worked much better than any model that presents predetermined values. So, what is the lesson to be learned from centuries of debate about the place of ethics in our schools? Most discussion in our schools centers on attention spans, discipline problems, gangs, AIDS, drugs, declining test scores and general apathy. We keep adding to the list every year. Moral obligations and social responsibility remain permanent but emphasis toward these goals has not been permanent.. Alfie Kohn suggests that children need choices in schools, as in life. Stakeholders in society come from participation and a sense of shared responsibility.[8] If indeed teachers have been given the role of moral agent, and historically they have, teaching to the students is not the answer. When it comes to moral accounting, there is a need for practice in moral dialogue and deliberation.

Although values clarification models have been around a long time, they have not been popular with teachers or the American public. Yet, their premise is to give students practice in moral judgement. The "lifeboat exercise," Aesop's Fables, and more recently case studies are attempts to revive moral deliberation in the classroom. These too will fail unless students, teachers, administrators and parents understand the purpose of these exercises. Too often the result is a relativistic and idiosyncratic preference on the part of the players, with-

out any real understanding of universal principles.

It falls upon teachers to be good models of moral conduct and deliberation. It is the teacher who will be a major figure in moral and civic education. A society predicated on self is a contradiction of terms. As J. L. Collier puts it, a people who will not sacrifice for the common good cannot expect to have any common good.[9] So, as a major theme in our educational process, it is imperative that our students get practice in moralizing. Why does it require practice rather than mere exposure to moral principles? A basic principle of any moral deliberation is to be other-oriented. Words like tolerance, fairness, truth, mutual interdependence, respect for human dignity, honesty and integrity require one to recognize and make choices within various contexts and circumstances. Just knowing general moral rules and principles is not enough. Taking a leaf from Immanuel Kant's writings, intent and respecting individuals as ends rather than means to an end must also be included. This author suggests, as do Rawls, Soltis and Strike, just to name a few, that a rule utilitarian approach (or reflective equilibrium between consequentialist and non-consequentialist ideologies) be the theme for teachers in moral accounting in the classroom. Students need to view circumstances and rules, individual rights and group benefits, intent and consequences when making moral deliberations. This takes practice. The "why" is as important as the intent, the weighed benefits, and the "what" in ethical conduct. Being moral is not merely a behavioral outcome, but is also a mindset to want to do the right thing. That requires recognition, weighing alternatives, and analysis is the process.[10]

In conclusion, although there is a natural tendency to place values education, character education and equity education into a curricular scheme and "do" it as possibly part of civic education (as was earlier suggested by this writer), there is also a danger of only doing it in social studies classes. If it is taught as a subject, it loses scope, breadth and universal application. All teachers are moral agents, whether it be in classroom conduct expected or in educational outcome desired. Moral deliberation is not subject-specific. Tolerance, fairness, honesty, and mutual interdependence can be learned in any class, and should be. To do otherwise is the fall into the trap of credentialling students rather than educating them.

NOTES

[1] See H. Giroux "Teachers as Transformatist Intellectuals" in S. Shapiro, et. al. (eds.). Critical Social Issues in American Education; New York: Longmans, 1993, p. 273.

[2] Christopher Lasch, "What's Wrong with the Right" in S. Shapiro and D. Purpel (eds.), Critical Social Issues in American Education; New York: Longmans, 1993. p. 45-46.

[3] Ibid. pp. 49-51.

[4] Ron Miller, What Are Schools For? Brandon, VT: Holistic Education Press, 1990. pp. 60-64.

[5] Rushworth Kidder, Newsletter, Institute for Global Ethics, August, 1993.

[6] See Edward Wynne, "A List of Values," Character II (Sept/Oct. 1986). Chester Finn, "Giving Shape to Cultural Conservatism," American Spectator (Nov. 1986), E. D. Hirsch, Cultural Literacy (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co, 1987), and Rushworth Kidder, "Global Ethics: A Resounding Yes," Insights on Global Ethics Vol. 3, No. 5, May 1993.

[7] R. Freeman Butts, "The Moral Imperative for American Schools: Inflame the Civic Temper" American Journal of Education. V. 96, No. 2, Feb., 1988. pp. 167-190

[8] Alfie Kohn, "Choices for Children: Why and How to Set Students Decide." Kappan, Vol. 75, No. 1, Sept. 1993. pp. 8-19.

[9] James L. Collier. The Rise of Selfishness in America. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993). See last chapter.

[10] See F. D. Kierstead and P. A. Wagner, The Ethical, Legal and Multicultural Foundations of Teaching. (Madison WI: W.C.Brown, 1993). pp. 154-56.

THE JUNKYARD DOG

Stan Ivie
Texas Woman's University

"Bad, bad, LeRoy Brown. Baddest man in the whole darn town. Badder than old King Kong. Meaner than a junkyard dog." So run the key lines from a Jim Croce song. LeRoy was really ticked off about something. What raised his ire? The lyrics do not give us a clue. Let me suggest one possibility. LeRoy used to be a very amicable fellow. That, however, was before he visited his daughter's elementary school. What LeRoy saw at school kicked him into a tizzy. What is taking place in the public schools is enough to make anyone "meaner than a junkyard dog."

What did LeRoy Brown see when he went to school? Here are some things that got LeRoy's goat. First, educators are worshipping a false idol, technology. While schools scramble to acquire the latest items in computer hardware, blackboards either stand idle or are covered with "tickitac." (Not enough room remains to work one good long division problem.) Second, public schools are obsessed with celebrating the outward symbols of education. Far less attention is given to acquiring the qualities of character that go with it. Educators are preoccupied with discussing accountability, testing, and outcomes based education. When was the last time you heard a talk on the intrinsic value of education itself? Third, though everyone wishes to evaluate teachers (the marketplace is flooded with teacher rating forms), no one asks whether or not the teacher is a loving person. Our schools are becoming unfeeling prisons. Fear stalks the halls. We are drifting dangerously close to falling into the lemming condition.

Have you ever witnessed the implosion of a tall building? It is a thing of awesome beauty. The key supports are blown; the building comes crashing down upon itself. Total destruction! Each brick in the structure retains in latent form all the energy required to fit it into place. Children are, metaphorically, like tall buildings. They retain all the latent energy (nurturing) invested in them by parents and teachers. When the energy is positive, children grow up to accomplish constructive things. When the energy is negative, they end up dynamiting the supports of society. (The Los Angeles riots are a case in point.)

Schools are designed to be nurturing institutions--places where children are sheltered and protected from the harsh realities of the larger world. Much of a teacher's day is given over to nurturing. Someone is always falling down, getting into a fight, or forgetting where they placed their materials. Noses need to be wiped; tears need to be dried. The teacher is superparent . . . giving love and encouragement to a room filled with children. Nurturing and teaching are mutually supporting concepts. Loving and learning infer one another. If nurturing is such an important function, and if it is part and parcel to education, why is it that nurturing receives so little attention from our national planners? The lack of love can place a nation at risk as surely as low achievement test scores.

What is honored in a country, Plato informs us, will be cultivated there. What is valued by a people will be taught in their schools. The problems of education are really those of the larger society. Ours is a society that values prepackaged, quick frozen, microwaved, and instantly gratifying products. Look at our foods. They are loaded with synthetic chemicals. (My chocolate syrup contains "genuine imitation flavoring.") From politics to plastics, everything is contrived. (A colleague once told me I would never make it in higher education unless I improved my image.) The entertainment industry thrives on selling fantasy. "Virtual reality" is just around the corner. Nothing is what it seems. What would you like to feel today? There is a pill for every mood. Up is down, in is out. Is it any wonder that our schools are in trouble?

We live in a world filled with illusions. One thing, however, is real--the children. Walk into any first grade classroom. The children will come flocking around you, wanting to know who you are, wanting to tell you something about themselves. The children are real and so is their need to be loved. The teacher is a love object. Children bond with their teachers. School work is performed for personal reasons--to gain the attention of the teacher. The truly competent teacher is a loving person. Now love is not something that can be measured by the yard or sold by the pound. It is a pervasive quality that permeates the life of the classroom. You can hear it in the teacher's voice; you can see it in the children's eyes. Love is the ultimate test of an effective school.

St. Thomas Aquinas once raised the question: "Can a man be taught by an angel?" Our age has posed an equally esoteric question: "Can a child be taught by a machine?" Some educators argue that computers will revolutionize education. Seymour Papert (1980), for instance, believes computerized instruction will usher in a new era in education--one in which schools as we know them today will no longer exist.

> I see the classroom as an artificial and inefficient learning environment that society has been forced to invent because its informal environments fail in certain essential learning domains . . . the computer presence will enable us to so modify the learning environment outside the classroom that much if not all the knowledge schools presently try to teach with such pain and expense and such limited success will be learned, as the child learns to talk, painlessly, successfully, and without organized instruction. This obviously implies that schools as we know them today will have no place in the future. (p. 9)

Can children learn all they need to know from a computer? (My under-graduate students receive all of their nutrition from machines.) Everything we know about education tells us it is a humanizing process. Schools are places where children learn how to connect with one another. Schools expose children to a wider sense of community. They learn to think, act, and feel with one another. Children who grow up with limited

human contact--little love, attention, or sharing--become psycho-logically warped and intellectually backward. There is no substitute for having loving parents. There are few things in education more important than having a caring teacher. If asked to decide between being taught by the world's most sophisticated computer (programmed with all the most up-to-date information) and sitting in the square at Athens and discussing philosophy with old Socrates (given all his misinformation about the world), which would you choose? I know my preference. At least with Socrates I would turn out to be human.

When does a useful piece of technology become a useless piece of junk? When it stands in the way of teaching and learning! Consider the following scenario. The teacher begins by using an overhead projector. Graphs, charts, and short lists of points are displayed meaningfully on a screen. The overhead works so well it is used to present an ever increasing flow of materials. Whole pages of text are displayed for students to copy. The overhead moves from being a teaching aid to becoming an instructional crutch. A codependency develops between the teacher and the machine. Soon every lessons require the use of the overhead projector. All information is placed on transparencies. The crutch has become a fortress--a walled castle surrounded by a moat--a defensive barricade separating the teacher from his or her students. The overhead projector comes to dominate the classroom. The teacher's methods become frozen and static. A fortress, though secure, is at one and the same time a prison. The teacher is locked into his or her chosen piece of technology. The servant has become the master.

Many schools are implementing systems of assertive discipline. These systems are based upon the findings of behavioral psychology. Students receive points (rewards) when they demonstrate the desired behaviors. They lose points (punishment) when they behave in a fashion that is irritating to the teacher. Does the system work? No, not really! Assertive discipline is simply another educational gimmick. The reason why it does not live up to its promises is very simple: The children are brighter than the psychologists who devised the system. Sure, if you wish to play funny little games, the children will play them with you. They are good sports. Everyone knows, however, that it is all just a game. Neither the rewards nor the punishments are real. There is, however, a bigger problem: Assertive discipline diverts time and attention away from the real objectives of education. It is a self-defeating activity. The real reward for learning is contained within the learning itself. It is intrinsic, not extrinsic. The reward for paying attention in class is the formation of the habit of knowing what is going on in the world. The best teachers do not use assertive discipline. They do not have to resort to artificial techniques in order to maintain discipline. Control is a matter of mutual respect between teacher and students. The learning activities themselves are the primary carriers of classroom control.

"Select the teacher, not the subject." This is the most basic truth in all education. There is a second, correlative truth. "The teacher is the subject." When someone has taught a class for many years, no clear distinction can be drawn between the teacher and the subject. Have you ever heard it said: "It is his (her) class because he (she) is the one who teaches it?" Ownership! Many classes die with the person who taught them. Teaching is at the very heart of education. Marva Collins' Way (1982) offers us a vivid description of the role of the teachers.

> The decisive factor was the teacher up in front of the class. If a child sensed a teacher didn't care, then all the textbooks and prepackaged lesson plans and audio-visual equipment and fancy, new, carpeted, air-conditioned building facilities weren't going to get the child to learn. (p. 26)

Teachers, Collins reminds us, are the key. "Everything works when the teacher works. It's as easy as that, and as hard" (p. 187).

Have you ever had a truly great teacher? Some of us have been so blessed. One such person served as my graduate advisor, Clifton Hall. A fellow graduate student once asked me what it was that made Hall unique. I told him it was the fact that Hall was a walking encyclopedia. He had read everything worth reading in the western world and half of the stuff in the eastern world. What is more he had remembered every word of it. (Hall had a magnificent memory.) Hall was no Tom Selleck. He stood barely five feet two inches tall. He was as bald as the day he was born, and he had the eyes of a hawk. What he lacked in physical stature, he more than made up for in intellectual acumen. Hall was a kindly terror in the classroom. Knowledge spewed forth on every subject. The only technology Hall ever used was a piece of chalk, which he rolled sideways in the palm of his hand. Hall exuded the spirit of scholarship. He ate, drank, and slept it. One could not think of the man without seeing books. Hall served on more doctoral committees than anyone else because he knew more about more subjects than anyone else. Hall personified what a university is all about, which is the legacy he left to his students.

What makes for greatness in a teacher? Erich Fromm (1974) believes it is the spiritual qualities a teacher shares with his or her students. The teacher is a model of the highest values of the culture. If we look at the substance of our lives, values and character are of more enduring importance than facts and figures. Fromm's words carry with them a prophetic ring.

> While we teach knowledge, we are losing that teaching which is the most important one for human development: the teaching which can only be given by the simple presence of a mature, loving person. In previous epochs of our own culture, or in China and India, the man most highly valued was the person with outstanding spiritual qualities. Even the teacher was not only, or even primarily, a source of information, but his function was to convey certain human attitudes. (p. 98)

Values are central to everything--to learning, to loving, to being human. Without positive values, society simply collapses. (Notice how one hand gun can disrupt an entire school.) Values cannot be learned from machines. They can only be acquired from other human beings. Values are learned by identifying with and by imitating persons we admire and respect. Parents are our first models; teachers come in a close second. Do your

students ever mimic your mannerisms? (Imitation is the highest form of flattery.) By imitating others we incorporate their values and actions into ourselves. The values we encourage in education--love of learning, good workmanship, pride in accomplishment--are not so much taught as they are caught. Values are the collateral learnings that rub off while we are pursuing other ends. They are the qualities that remain after the minutiae we memorized by heart for the examination have long been forgotten.

What can be done to help our friend LeRoy Brown so that he doesn't have to spend his whole life being "meaner than a junkyard dog?" How can we restore an element of sanity to the public schools? Let me suggest a few simple measures that would ameliorate the situation: First, educators need to recognize the fact that technology will not save us. We cannot engineer our way out of human problems. Greed, envy, hate, and despair. Why so much unhappiness in the world? Technology cannot give to us that which we have denied to ourselves. Second, educators need to rethink their priorities. The demands for accountability, testing, and outcomes based education have thrown the whole system out of balance. Teaching and learning have taken a back seat to stuffing students with information for the standardized examinations. Testing has become an end-in-itself. The mania has got to stop! Third, education needs to be rejuvenated with the spirit of love. For Erich Fromm (1974) cautions, "any society which excludes, relatively, the development of love, must in the long run perish of its own contradiction with the basic necessities of human nature" (pp. 11-112).

References

Collins, M. (1990). Marva Collins' way. Los Angeles, CA: Jeremy P. Tarcher.

Fromm, E. (1974). The art of loving. New York: Harper & Row.

Papert, S. (1980). Mindstorms children, computers, and powerful ideas. New York: Basic Books.

THE DEAD DOG

Stanley D. Ivie
Texas Woman's University

Introduction

How should professionals be educated? The Flexner Report (1910) revamped medical education in the United States. Medical schools were upgraded and placed on a scientific foundation. A low status occupation was transformed into a high prestige profession. Science was instrumental in making the difference. Educators looked enviously at medicine. Why not reform teacher education along similar lines? There was nothing wrong with teaching that a good dose of science would not cure. Following the medical model (metaphor), educators began to speak the language of science. Some educators borrowed from the psychologists. Thorndike's Laws of Learning and Skinner's operant conditioning became commonplace in the nation's schools. Other educators endorsed diagnostic and prescriptive teaching. Teachers would diagnose and treat learning problems similar to the way doctors diagnosed and treated diseases. Educational technologists, not wishing to be left out of the equation, hurried to approve computerized instruction. Children's minds were compared to the workings of a computer. Teachers would provide in-put; students would respond with out-put. Everyone jumped eagerly aboard the scientific metaphor.

Madeline Hunter, the peripatetic professor from UCLA, is an avid spokesperson for the scientific metaphor in teacher education. "Teaching," according to Hunter (1984), is "one of the last professions to emerge from the stage of 'witch doctoring' and become a profession based on a science of learning" (p. 169). What makes teaching a science? Educators can show cause and effect relationships between teaching and learning. These relationships can be used to promote learning in the same way a doctor uses medical knowledge to promote health. Hunter believes "teaching is an applied science derived from research in human learning and human behavior: an applied science that utilizes the findings of psychology, neurology, sociology, and anthropology" (p. 171). The science of teaching can be learned by anyone who is willing to expend the necessary time and effort. Hunter (1984) uses a medical metaphor to describe teacher education. The preparation of teachers should be similar to the preparation of doctors. Both professions are based on scientific knowledge. Just as the "medical student learns what is known about anatomy, physiology, and pharmacology and then applies that knowledge to promote health, the future teacher needs to learn what is currently known about cause-effect relationships in human learning to promote student achievement" (p. 190).

Why is scientific teacher education a metaphor? An adequate answer requires a little backtracking. Simple metaphors are created whenever we speak of one thing as if it were another. (Birds of a feather flock together.) Complex metaphors, on the other hand, come into being when we smuggle thought systems across the **border**--use conceptual tools developed in one field of inquiry to explain phenomena in a very different field of inquiry. (Newton's mechanistic model of the universe led Enlightenment Deists to conclude God was the great watchmaker.) Scientific teacher education belongs to the second class of metaphors. The methods and language of science simply do not fit professional education. The preparation of teachers is about as scientific as a good stew. The gains of the laboratory have not found their way into the classroom. Why has science failed in the realm of education? The reason is simple, people. If we wish to have a science, we must first select a subject whose behavior is lawful. Hydrogen and oxygen bond to form water. Never Dr. Pepper! The same cannot be said of human behavior. There is a capricious side to human nature. (Theologians call it free will.) Richard Hansger (1991), after considering the case for a science of education, concludes, "The study of education does not lend itself to an experimental approach" (p.694). There are simply too many variables that cannot be controlled. The more a discipline deals with people, the less it resembles the sciences. "To speak of a science of education is to speak non-sense" (p. 694).

If the scientific metaphor has proven fruitless, what do we have to offer in its place? Educators have not explored the richness and variety inherent in aesthetic metaphors. Education is more like the arts than it is like the sciences. Which is not to suggest there are no rules for preparing teachers, for certainly there are. These rules, however, are more like those for training artists and musicians than they are like those for training doctors and engineers. Teaching is more like painting, dancing, and acting than it is like conducting a laboratory experiment. Education shares as much in common with intuition and feeling as it does with rationality and logic. The complexities of teaching and learning cannot be reduced to a mathematical equation. Just as there are no laws for creating great art, so there are no laws for preparing great teachers. (Socrates never attended a Normal school.) What are some artful and suggestive ways of thinking about teaching?

Teaching Metaphors

When I think about teaching, a number of metaphors come to mind. There are days when I feel teaching is like driving a herd of cattle across the plains. Rawhide! I am a lone rider trying to keep the doggies heading down the trail. Some want to stray away from the herd and graze; others wish to stampede in the wrong direction. (I usually think of this metaphor when I have a large class of undergraduate students.) Herding cattle is exhausting. There are other days when I feel teaching is like exploring Mammoth Cave. Something exciting is waiting there in the darkness. New territory to be mapped. (This metaphor comes to mind when I have a small class of graduate students.) Exploring is fun. Sometimes I think teaching is a way of creating a human mosaic in the

*This paper was inadvertently omitted from last year's journal.

classroom. Each student represents a brightly colored piece of glass. When all the pieces are fitted together, a meaningful pattern begins to emerge. The whole transcends the sum of its parts. Aesthetic qualities of experience arise from the group that were not present in the individual lives. Teaching and learning form an intricate mosaic. The aesthetic product is ourselves. The classroom mosaic is never finished. New facets are always being added to its character.

I am partial to the gamesmanship metaphor. Have you ever visited Law Vegas? Teaching is like playing a hand of poker. How you play the game depends upon the hand you are holding. (Students are the cards.) You never know what you have until the first day of class. Sometimes you are allowed to discard (drops). Other times you can receive a hit (adds). All cards are dealt by the registrar. There are no pat hands! A good hand contains a few face cards. They are the students who stand out in class--who have distinctive personalities--who make good comments--whose names are easy to remember. The Queen of hearts, for example, is usually a motherly figure who takes a personal interest in the class. She is warm and supportive, explaining the teacher's idiosyncrasies to the other students. It is always nice to hold an Ace. An Ace is a person who has something of substance to say. When you need a moment to reflect, an Ace will pick up the slack. No classroom is complete without its Joker. The Joker is good for humor. The more you lean on a Joker, the better he or she likes it. Jokers are natural born exhibitionists. Once I was lecturing on the races of mankind. Negroids, Mongoloids, and Caucasoids had all been mentioned. "Some anthropologists," I said, "think there is a fourth possibility." I hoped someone might suggest the Australoids--the aboriginal inhabitants of Australia. The class Joker, however, said, "Aren't they the hemorrhoids?"

The world of art is rich in metaphor. Art is an imaginative representation of life. Music, poetry, painting, literature, sculpture, and dance--each speaks a symbolic language of its own. "Each medium," John Dewey (1934) tells us, "says something that cannot be uttered as well or as completely in any other tongue . . . each art speaks an idiom that conveys what cannot be said in another language and yet remain the same" (p. 106). Ballet, for example, has its own distinctive language. It is metaphor in motion. Swan Lake is one grand symbolic synthesis. The people and the swans become one. Classical music reflects abstract metaphors. The polyphonic music of Bach elevates the spirit upward. (Most of Bach's compositions were written for churches.) Prokofiev, by contrast, speaks the language of the twentieth century. His music reminds us of the shrill sounds of a mechanized world. Painting uses the language of line and color. Picasso offers us the mere hint of an idea. Much is left to the viewer's imagination. Art links the spontaneity of the child to the disciplined intelligence of the adult. That is why it appeals to all ages. Art adds depth and appreciation to experience. Without it the world sinks back into a dingy gray.

Traditional Chinese philosophy centered around the metaphor of yin and yang. Yin represents the female energy in the universe; yang reflects the male. Yin is seen as being closed and mysterious; yang is characterized as being open and logical. Two brain theory is today's psychological equivalent to yin and yang. The right hemisphere is for feeling and intuition; the left one is for language and logic. Though we may think of the two hemispheres as being separate, they are in continuous communication with one another. (The only exceptions are persons who have suffered damage to the corpus callosum.) Intuition is balanced by reason. Every human activity calls for a balance of brain functions. The right brain provides us with imagination and insight; the left brain checks our intuitions with logic and experience. Select an area of artistic endeavor--music, painting, or dance--and you will discover the artist has achieved a productive balance between imagination and discipline. What is true of art is equally true of teaching. Artistic teaching strikes a proper balance between yin and yang. Teaching, when it is at its very best, weds feeling and thought together.

Metaphor possesses a certain mind-grabbing quality. It uses picturesque language. Vivid language can capture the imagination of even a dull and lifeless classroom of students. The mind virtually jumps to grab a juicy metaphor. Have you ever tried becoming your own metaphor? It is a way of adding instant life and humor to the classroom. The teacher, for a moment, slips into some simplistic role. Students enjoy hearing stories of how their teachers behaved when they were children. (It makes the teacher real.) Sometimes I tell my students how I used to tease my younger brother. We always went to the Saturday matinee. (Actually my mother bribed me to take him.) The best pictures were the horror films. My favorite was "The Thing." I could play the monster to a tee. My brother had a vivid imagination. The mere suggestion of the monster was enough to send him screaming through the house. My students, like my brother, enjoy seeing me recreate the monster. Metaphors and monsters appeal to the child inside.

Body language is critical to the teacher's art. Students read who we are from how we behave. The hands are of particular importance. Gestures are physical metaphors. They are thoughts made visible. Do you wish to capture your student's attention? Then gesture with your left hand. What is special about the left hand? It is hard to say. The left hand simply attracts more attention. Its captivating effects may have something to do with its being connected to the right side of the brain--the seat of our intuitive and artistic powers. Whatever the reason, it works. Practice making sweeping gestures with your left hand. Feel its power. Fancy your hand is a bird, catching an updraft and climbing aloft. Punctuate your points like a conductor. Catch an idea and hurl it across the room. Watch your students' eyes. See how they follow your every movement. There is magic in your left hand.

A classroom is a living, breathing human personality. (An organic metaphor.) Each group of students has its own distinctive characteristics. A sensitive teacher can feel the personality of the group the minute he or she enters the classroom. How are teachers able to attune themselves to the group? Teaching is as much a matter of intuition as it is one of rationality. Teachers need to be able to read the feelings of their students. Intuition is a useful tool for tapping into a group's energy. Coming to know the personality of a class is a matter of trusting one's intuitions. What can be accomplished with a group--the mode of instruction that best suits the group's learning style--is dependent upon the collective personality of the students. Some groups are warm and recep-

tive; others are standoffish. One group may prefer racing ahead; the next may feel more comfortable plodding behind. Some groups have an open sense of humor; others are closed minded and easily offended. What the teacher is able to achieve will depend upon the group's collective personality. A skilled teacher comes to know the classroom personality of his or her students as soon as possible, not later than the end of the first week of school.

Teaching is a multifaceted activity. One of the teacher's roles is that of entertainer. Do you wish to hold your students' attention? Then interject a little humor. Humor is a wonderful way of reinforcing learning. Humor frequently makes use of metaphor. Johnny Carson, when he was on the Tonight Show, had a way of letting humorous situations unfold naturally. Robin Williams is a master of ambiguity. His humor hinges on the double meaning of words. Jonathan Winters is a whiz at improvisation. He can pull a story out of thin air. Classroom humor should never be insulting or in poor taste. Never make your students the brunt of our jokes! Don Rickles may get away with calling people "hockey pucks." Such language, however, does not score a goal in the classroom. Jack Benny's style provides a more suitable model. People always enjoyed appearing on the Jack Benny Show. They were given all the good lines. Benny was the fall guy. Students love to catch their teachers being human. Have you ever made a Freudian slip? I have slipped and fallen many times. Once I missed on the word "fabrication." Humor is a good way of building classroom rapport.

Metaphor is basic to creativity. Thinking metaphorically helps to create an imaginative picture of the world. Reality is reduced to its basic essentials. Why do children flock to the television on Saturday mornings? It has something to do with the magic of cartoons. Cartoons are visual metaphors. Walt Disney touched a universal chord in the human spirit when he invented Mickey Mouse. Cartoons speak to the child in each of us. Cartoons present a simplified picture of the world. Characters are sketched in outline form. Cartoons are animated, filled with life and action. Two-dimensional figures appear to jump off the screen. Cartoon characters embody human qualities. They walk and talk like real people. Cartoons are metaphorical statements on life.

Are there any cartoon characters in your family? In my family it was my Uncle Hoover. His name, of course, was not really Hoover. But that is what everyone called him. Uncle Hoover sold vacuum cleaners, thus the name. He was a salesman, par excellence. His life's energy centered around his mouth. Uncle Hoover loved to talk. Eating came in a close second. Uncle Hoover was a chain smoker. He consumed beer by the truck load. Hoover was always overweight and out of breath. Perspiration rolled eternally off his bald head. His bodily functions had long ago stopped working on their own. Hoover took pills by the score. Milk of Magnesia was used to start him; Pepto Bismol acted to stop him. Everything was chased down by Alka Seltzer. When Uncle Hoover came for a visit, he always did all the cooking. He loved fried chicken. Cornbread was also a high priority item. Being the cook placed Hoover in the position of being able to select the biggest and best piece of chicken for himself. (A smaller serving was held back for a between meals snack.) Are you beginning to get a picture of my Uncle Hoover? Metaphorical characters are wonderful teaching aids.

Educators have not paid sufficient attention to aesthetic metaphors. By the same token, they have overworked the scientific metaphor. Not enough recognition has been given to teaching as art. There is a mystical side to teaching that is rarely discussed in the literature. It concerns aesthetic unification. This experience occurs in many different areas of life. It is most visible in the world of sports. When Nadia Comaneci scored a perfect 10 on the parallel bars, she achieved aesthetic fusion. She became one with the activity. The same is true of Bob Beaman's record-setting jump of 29+ feet at the 1968 Olympics. Beaman had never jumped 29 feet before; he never jumped it again. His execution that day was flawless. He achieved aesthetic fusion with the long jump. Tennis players speak of "being in the zone." A player who has achieved flow is playing at his or her best. It is as if the game were playing the athlete rather than the other way around. The play and the player are one. Teachers can experience aesthetic unification. Flow happens, if only for a moment, when the teacher and the students unite in the pursuit of knowledge. There is a mystical source of energy carrying everyone along. Learning shifts into high gear. Discrete pieces of information suddenly come together. Student interest peaks. Discipline vanishes from the scene. Insights come in brilliant flashes. The whole classroom comes alive. Such moments are rare and precious gems. They are to be savored as rewards for excellence in teaching.

Conclusion

How to end? What better way than with a story. (Stories are allegorical metaphors.) This is a story about little Billy and old Rover. Little Billy had a best friend, old Rover. Billy and Rover always played ball together on the front lawn. One day Billy threw the ball too hard. It rolled into the street. Rover, being the loyal dog that he was, jumped the fence and ran after the ball. A speeding car failed to stop. Billy's best friend was dead. Billy's mother, wishing to do the proper thing, arranged for a burial plot. On the day of the funeral, the family gathered and said words over the pine box. Billy wept big tears. Billy's mother, hoping to lighten her son's burden, said, "Don't worry, Billy, old Rover is now with God." Billy, looking up at his mother, asked, "Mom, what does God want with a dead dog?" Educators might wish to raise the same question about scientific teacher education.

References

Dewey, J. (1934). Art as experience. New York: Minton, Balch.

Hansger, R. D. (1991, May). Can education become a science? Phi Delta Kappan, pp. 689-694.

Hunter, M. (1984). Knowing, teaching, and supervision. In P.L.Hosford (Ed.), Using what we know about teaching (pp.169-192). Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

RECONSTRUCTION AND DECONSTRUCTION: IMPLICATIONS OF CONTEMPORARY CRITICAL THEORY FOR QUALITATIVE RESEARCH TECHNIQUES

James D. Swartz
University of Arkansas

I. Introduction

I have had an interest in what may loosely be referred to as critical theory for a long time. I also teach qualitative research. The two topics seem to have much in common. There are numerous books and articles about critical theory and qualitative research but relatively few that connect the two.

Qualitative Research

This comes to mind each semester when I introduce the various types of qualitative research. For example, Michael Quinn Patton (1990) lists ten qualitative research traditions. They are: ethnography, phenomenology, heuristics, ethnomethodology, symbolic interaction, ecological psychology, systems theory, chaos theory, hermeneutics, and orientational. Ethnography comes from anthropology and is a an inductive study of culture. Phenomenology, from philosophy, involves the structure and essence of experience. Heuristics is the qualitative study of intensive personal experience from a psychological perspective. In heuristics, questions about an individual's experience with a phenomenon and the experience of others with the same phenomenon are asked. While heuristics deals with intense experience ethnomethodology deals with everyday experience. Ethnomethodology is a sociological perspective that focuses on how people make sense of everyday life in order to act in socially acceptable ways. Symbolic interaction started with George Herbert Mead's thoughts about how people exchange symbols to give meaning to their actions and the actions of others. Ecological psychology, which is sometimes known as ecocultural theory, studies individuals and groups as they attempt to accomplish their goals through specific behaviors in specific environments. Systems theory is a holistic view of how systems function and how people behave within a specific system. Chaos theory is about nonlinear dynamics and documents the underlying order of disorder (if there is any). The origin of chaos theory is theoretical physics. Hermeneutics is a product of theology, philosophy, and literary criticism and attends to the conditions surrounding human behavior and how those conditions give meaning to human action and interaction. The most significant part of hermeneutics is how these conditions, and actions are interpreted as "text." Patton concludes his list with the orientational tradition in which investigators try to establish how a particular ideological perspective manifests itself in a given phenomenon. There are at least three important qualitative research traditions which Patton does not include in his list: semiotics, discourse analysis, and historical analysis. Semiotics (Lincoln & Guba, 1989) is a search for a grammar in human interaction and the products of human interactions like mass media. Discourse or conversational analysis is entirely devoted to studying human speech (Everston & Green, 1986). "Talk" is recorded and analyzed to discover the basis of interactions between speakers. Each of these research traditions seems open to the philosophical and analytical tools of critical theory. Historical analysis attempts to understand current events in terms of their historical antecedents (Strauss & Corbin, 1990).

Thomas McCarthy's (1991) book, **Ideals and Illusions on Reconstruction and Deconstruction in Contemporary Critical Theory,** came out in paperback in 1993. The first chapter, "Philosophy and Social Practice: Richard Rorty's 'New Pragmatism,'" named some of the qualitative research traditions listed above and was, consequently, of great interest to me. This chapter was the link between qualitative research and critical theory that I had been seeking. The title for this paper seemed a natural result of reading McCarthy's first chapter about Rorty's neopragmatic views. Connections between reconstruction, deconstruction, and qualitative research are the topic of this essay.

Reconstruction

Thomas McCarthy quotes Habermas as Habermas writes about reconstruction. Reconstruction or "reconstructive science" designates "any undertaking aimed at the explicit, systematic reconstruction of implicit, 'pretheoretical' knowledge'" (McCarthy, 1978, p. 276). It involves the "systematic reconstruction of general structures that appear in every possible speech situation, that are themselves produced through the performance of specific types of linguistic utterances, and that serve to situate pragmatically the expressions generated by the linguistically competent speaker" (McCarthy, 1978, p. 276). This does not define reconstruction; but what may be evident in the short excerpts from McCarthy's book, **The Critical Theory of Jurgen Habermas,** is a concern by Habermas for the reconstruction of patterns found in speech in order to learn more about social practice and knowledge. For Habermas, reconstruction is a process of exposing the symbolically structured reality of the social world by examining the rules and structures that allow us to specify and describe the world. By reconstructing the underlying structures of speech which are there waiting to be recovered from their pretheoretical form, it is hoped that the structure of human knowledge may be revealed. The knowledge sought for appears to be a pragmatically situated linguistic structure. For philosophers and for qualitative researchers, reconstruction may be a means of studying the speech act in order to understand human behavior.

Deconstruction

Derrida's (1987) deconstruction also searches for a structure but searches beyond the present or the speech act in search of a what is an absent network or chain of conditions, presuppositions and mediations which bring sense to human action.

> "The subject, and first of all the conscious and speaking subject, depends upon the system of differences and the movement of *differance*." The process of signification, as Derrida put it, is a "play of differences" such that "no element can function as a sign without referring to other elements" that are not themselves present, and every element is "constituted on the basis of the trace within it of the other elements of the chain." Because the tissue of relations and differences inevitably leaves its trace in any signifier, we can never achieve simple univocacy of meaning. Beyond any present meaning lies the absent, unspoken, unthought, indeed largely uncomprehended network of conditions, presuppositions and mediations on which it depends. As a result, our meaning always escapes any unitary conscious grasp we may have of it, for language, as "writing," inevitably harbors the possibility of an endless "dissemination" of sense, an indefinite multiplicity of recontextualizations and reinterpretations.
>
> ...And this repression of what doesn't fit inevitably has its effects, in the forms of the paradoxes, internal contradictions, and systematic incoherencies, which it is the task of deconstructive analysis to bring to light" (McCarthy, 1991, p. 100).

McCarthy cites a few lines from a discussion of deconstruction that seem particularly helpful.

> It inaugurates the deconstruction, not the demolition but the de-sedimentation, the de-construction, of all the significations that have their source in that of the logos. Particularly the signification of *truth*..

It seems that the task of the deconstructionist is to investigate a given social act and look for meaning by exploring the source of inconsistencies, differences and contradictions that hide its meaning from our immediate understanding. Landon Winner (1977, p. 330), who sought to "dismantle" technology made a comment quite relevant to the notion of deconstruction. "The method of carefully and deliberately dismantling technologies, epistemological Luddism if you will, is one way of recovering the buried substance upon which our civilization rests. Once unearthed, that substance could again be scrutinized, criticized, and judged." This seems to be the task of the deconstructionist. To discover the chain of logic leading from and to a social act that, if known, would provide meaning for the social act.

Summary

I will not pretend to draw clear differences between reconstruction and deconstruction from my extremely brief discussion of these terms. Thomas McCarthy devotes an entire well-written book to the subject and makes no such claim. What is of interest here is the use of reconstruction to analyze language and its underlying structures and the use of deconstruction to understand social acts and language though extensive research of meaningful data.

The excellent work of Lather (1986, 1991) on the implications of critical theory for qualitative research is well known but focuses mainly on overcoming dominance through emancipatory theory and practice. These issues are among the most important in education today. I simply want to focus on the issues that McCarthy has raised in his book, **Ideals and Illusions on Reconstruction and Deconstruction in Contemporary Critical Theory**, and their relevance to doing qualitative research. Due to my interest in pragmatism and its relevance to qualitative research, I will focus on the first chapter, "Philosophy and Social Practice: Richard Rorty's 'New Pragmatism.'"

II. Implications of Deconstruction and Reconstruction for Qualitative Research

A Philosophical Frame

One common stand that seems to exist between most of the critical theorists that I have read or read about, is the idea that there is the concept of community. Derrida, Foucault, Habermas, Rorty, and qualitative researchers all seek an understanding of community. Since the focus of the paper is Rorty, I will review his conceptualization of "solidarity" which is his version of community.

I offer the following series of quotes from part one of Rorty's (1991) Objectivity, Relativism, and Truth to describe solidarity.

> There are two principle ways in which reflective human beings try, by placing their lives in a larger context, to give sense to those lives. The first is by telling the story of their contribution to a community (p. 21).

For Rorty, there is a mutual shaping between community (solidarity) and individuals. In his rejection of the relativist label, Rorty discusses the ethical nature of truth that is based in cultural ethnocentricity.

> "Relativism" is the traditional epithet applied to pragmatism by realists. Three different views are commonly referred to by this name. The first is the view that every belief is as good as every other. The second is the view that "true" is an equivocal term, having as many meanings as there are procedures of justification. The third is the view that there is nothing to be said about either truth or rationality apart from description of the familiar procedures of justification. The

> third is the view that there is nothing to be said about either truth or rationality apart from description of the familiar procedures of justification which a given society - *ours* - uses in one or another area of inquiry. The pragmatist holds the ethnocentric third view. But he does not hold the self-refuting first view, nor the eccentric second view. He thinks that his views are better than the realists, but he does not think that his views correspond to the nature of things. He thinks that the very flexibility of the word "true" - the fact that it is merely an expression of commendation - insures its univocity. The term "true" on his account, means the same in all cultures, just equally flexible terms like "here," "there," "good," "bad," "you," and "me" mean the same in all cultures. But the identity of meaning is, of course, compatible with diversity of reference, and with diversity of procedures for assigning the terms (p. 23).

In the next two quotes, I believe Rorty draws a line between moral questions and ethical questions. He seems to see a relationship between a community defined through cooperative human inquiry and ethical definitions of right and wrong. It is through the study of ethical behavior that we define and understand our community as philosophers and as qualitative researchers.

> But the pragmatist does not have a theory of truth, much less a relativistic one. As a partisan of solidarity, his account of the value of cooperative human inquiry has only an ethical base, not an epistemological or metaphysical one (p. 24).

> Either we attach a special privilege to our own community, or we pretend an impossible tolerance for every other group.
>
> I have been arguing that we pragmatists should grasp the ethnocentric horn of this dilemma. We should say that we must, in practice, privilege our own group, even though there can be noncircular justification for doing so. We must insist that the fact that nothing is immune from criticism does not mean that we have a duty to justify everything. We Western liberal intellectuals should accept the fact that we have to start from where we are, and that this means that there are lots of views which we simply cannot take seriously (p. 29).

Fuzziness, as it is defined in the next quote, refers to establishing community standards through unforced agreement like an exchange of qualitative criticisms. Through such exchanges we can become aware of who we are as a community.

> What I am calling "pragmatism" might also be called "left-wing Kuhnianism." It has been also rather endearingly called (by one of its critics, Clark Glymour) the "new fuzziness," because it is an attempt to blur just those distinctions between the objective and the subjective and between fact and value which the critical conception of rationality has developed. We fuzzies would like to substitute the idea of "unforced agreement" for that of "objectivity" (p. 38).

In this quotation, Rorty describes his utopia of reciprocal loyalty. He sees the preservation and self-improvement of community as essential to its survival. Philosophy and qualitative research are attempts to describe knowledge within a community and to explain the ethical knowledge upon which Rorty's community or someone else's idea of community might work.

> In this heyday of the fuzzy, there would be as little reason to be self-conscious about the nature and status of one's discipline as, in the ideal democratic community, about the nature and status of one's race or sex. For one's ultimate loyalty would be to the larger community which permitted and encouraged this kind of freedom and insouciance. This community would have no higher end than its own preservation and self-improvement, the preservation and enhancement of civilization. It would identify rationality with that effort, rather than with the desire for objectivity. So it would feel no need for a foundation more solid than reciprocal loyalty (p. 45).

This is the essence of Rorty's solidarity. These basic ideals and ideas are what critical theorists and qualitative researchers investigate. "What is going on here" (Leiter, 1980; Strauss & Corbin, 1990), is a basic question for qualitative researchers. If we accept that communities honor their own ethnocentrism, which seems to be an assumption found in many qualitative textbooks, then the role of qualitative researcher and philosopher is to uncover these ethnocentric assumptions from communities. This seems to be the intention of Derrida, Foucault and Rorty, while Habermas and McCarthy may hope to discover more universal principles through their methods. McCarthy states his optimistic view of critical theory:

> In the view I adopt here, a number of deconstructive motifs and techniques, stripped of their totalizing pretensions, could be integrated into a pragmatic approach to communications, where they might serve as antidotes to our deep-seated tendency to hypostatize ideas of reason into realized or realizable states of affairs. If such ideas are ineluctable presuppositions of our participation in social life, and if participation cannot be wholly displaced by observation - not even by participant observation - we can at least try to become observant, reflective participants and allow the insights gained from distancing to inform our engagement. If deconstructionist concerns were made an abiding feature of social practice, we might carry out the socially necessary construction of concepts, theories, techniques, laws, institutions, identities, and so on with greater sensitivity to what doesn't fit neatly into our schemes (McCarthy, 1991, p. 6).

Relationship to Qualitative Research

McCarthy's hope is to play one part of our mind against another part in order to gain more insight into our words and beliefs. This seems relevant to understanding and using qualitative techniques. For example, Guba and Lincoln's (1989) **Fourth Generation Evaluation** utilizes this approach for evaluating programs when they encourage community members to "negotiate" meaning from the evaluation process rather than distill it from "the facts." Although Guba and Lincoln skillfully seek guidance from a hermeneutic approach to qualitative research, it seems possible that they could also use reconstruction and deconstruction to inform their methodology.

The relationship between critical theory and qualitative methods in general; the notion of subjectivity, reflexivity, and the role of the participant observer offer some specific examples of how critical theory might help to support qualitative research strategies.

Qualitative Methods in General

Speaking of Rorty, McCarthy writes:

> He means by this to emphasize the temporal rather than the atemporal, the contingent rather than the necessary, the local rather than the universal, the immanent rather than the transcendent features of such practices, or more precisely, to deny the latter in the name of the former.
>
> The key to Rorty's epistemological behaviorism is viewing justification as a social phenomenon, of that understanding knowledge becomes a matter of understanding the social practices in which we justify beliefs. ... Explicating rationality and epistemic authority, then, is not a matter of coming up with transcendental arguments but of providing thick ethnographic account of knowledge-producing activities: "If we understand the rules of a language game, we understand all that there is to know about why the moves in that language game are made" - all, that is, except for a historical account of how the rules of the game came to have the shape they do, and other "non-epistemological" lines of inquiry (McCarthy, 1991, p. 14).

It is the particular, inductively gathered, that is the stuff or data of qualitative research. In this sense, qualitative researchers are deconstructivists looking into behaviors and speech; deconstructive not only in Rorty's sense but in Derrida's sense of following the chain wherever it leads. Qualitative research is deconstructive because researchers search for patterns in behavior and speech. Searching what is available within a specific context and setting in order to discover the rules of the game is the work of qualitative research (Spradley, 1980). While McCarthy claims that Rorty's work is not concerned with history (I am not sure how a pragmatist, by definition, can be said to be uninterested in historical accounts because current interaction requires knowledge of a past store of verbal and nonverbal symbols (Miller, 1973; Dewey, 1984), autobiography, biography, and life histories are a common part of qualitative research (Marshall & Rossman, 1989).

Subjectivity, Reflexivity, and the Role of the Participant Observer

McCarthy expresses some concern for the role of the participant observer and the subjective nature of his or her role.

> Interpreters inevitably bring with themselves the perspectives and concerns of their own cultures; they cannot avoid relying upon the taken-for-granted assumptions built into the languages and practices that comprise their own forms of life. In the case at hand, this means that we can distance ourselves from certain of our cultural practices only by taking other for granted. We can never be observers without at the same time being participants.
>
> . . . If we grant that we are always "more being than consciousness," as he says, this is no less true of the revolutionary critic than of the traditional conservative. Both will inevitably take much more for granted than they will consciously question, accept, or reject (McCarthy, 1991, p. 18).

As qualitative researchers we seek to answer the problem of subjectivity in a number of ways but it always present. Prolonged engagement with field research helps to sort out inconsistencies in our data over time. Persistent engagement is the process of pressing anomalies in our data to find the source of contradictions in observations, interviews, and nonintrusive data. Peer debriefing subjects our information to the scrutiny of other researchers. Members checks give the people we study an opportunity to "set the record straight" by having informants read the raw data of our observations and interviews to make possible corrections due to the researcher's biases or misconceptions. Audit trails are formal documents that list inferences or conclusions drawn from data along side the data that these inferences or conclusions were drawn from. But in the end we are caught in the web of our own cultural assumptions and held there as researchers and practitioners. Peshkin (1988), in his article about subjectivity, suggested that the best response to our own subjectivity is to explore one's own subjectivity, make it public, and, as a good researcher, be constantly aware of the subjective nature of any research effort.

What do we do with the results of deconstructive and reconstructive qualitative research? The notion of transfer (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) suggests that we present data to the reader who decides how much of what has been compiled and interpreted transfers to the reader's context. In qualitative research, transfer replaces generalizability. It would seem that transfer depends on reflexivity it two ways. The researcher reflects on the data during collection, analysis and interpretation. The consumer or reader of research reflects on what he or she has read to determine its relevance and meaning for the reader's context of research or practice. McCarthy commented on the problem of reflexivity.

> Thus if we want to make sense of social situations, we cannot help but relate reflexively to background schemes of interpretation and expectation and draw actively on our capacities for

practical reasoning in concrete situations. In any case, as competent actors we shall be held accountable for doing so. That is to say, we believe ourselves to be, and take others as being, knowledgeable subjects, confronted by real choices, for which we and they will be held accountable. In normal social interaction we reciprocally impute practical rationality to interaction partners, credit them with knowing what they are doing and why they are doing it, view their conduct as under their control and done for some purpose or reason know to them, and thus hold them responsible for it (McCarthy, 1991, p. 30).

We look for patterns in behavior that may be random. Hopefully, as good researchers we can discover the difference between random and patterned behavior. But our assumptions about data gathered from investigating social interaction are likely to be influenced by a culturally biased reflexive filter. Readers may suffer the same problem when thinking about, reflecting about, qualitative research they have read.

The problems which seem to arise in the practice of deconstructive and reconstructive criticism seem to be relevant to the conceptualization of qualitative research. The main theme of this paper is that even more attention needs to be given by qualitative researchers to the philosophical and practical issues raised by critical theorists. The common problems and issues that are evident in the literature of qualitative research and of critical theorists like Derrida, Foucault, Habermas, and Rorty are timely and relevant.

Summary and Conclusion

I want to end from the point that I more or less started from by reviewing the list of qualitative research traditions that I started with, placing them in columns and indicating whether I think they are more reconstructive or deconstructive in general orientation. Reconstructive critical theory tends to look for pretheoretical principals discovered by examining various types of speech. Habermas's quest is to discover universal principals that allow social communication and human interaction to occur. Communication is situated in pragmatic human interactions and Habermas holds that we can come to know knowledge embodied in speech by studying the structure of a competent speaker's speech activities. Deconstructive critical theory does not look for universal principles but seeks only to understand social interaction in order to improve our communities. A deconstructivist looks for the codes and reasons for how people form and maintain moral communities. They look for these codes in verbal and nonverbal speech and through the study of human interaction. But it may be their intent that sets them apart in the end. Bernstein's (1983) comments about Richard Rorty seems to make the point.

> We must appreciate the extent to which our sense of community is threatened . . . by the faulty epistemological doctrines that fill our heads. The moral task of the philosopher or cultural critic is to defend the openness of human conversation against all those temptations and real threats that seek closure (p. 205).

I have placed the qualitative research traditions noted in the introduction under columns that I believe best represent their basic orientations.

Reconstructive	**Deconstructive**
semiotic analysis	ethnography
discourse or conversational analysis	phenomenology
systems theory	heuristics
chaos theory	ethnomethodology
historical analysis	symbolic interaction
	ecological psychology
	hermeneutics
	orientational

Those traditions which fall under the reconstructive tend to search for enduring categories that support an explanation of speech or behavior. Those traditions under the deconstructive column tend to avoid closure in favor of existing culturally bound working hypotheses fashioned to inform current practice. The column assignments are somewhat arbitrary. While semiotic analysis, discourse analysis, and systems theory seem to fit comfortably under reconstructive criticism, chaos theory and historical analysis may not. What does seem to be interesting is to apply the ideas of reconstructive criticism to specific qualitative research traditions. It seems to demonstrate a connection between critical theory and qualitative research. A thorough analysis of why each tradition is placed under one column or another is the subject of a separate paper. The reader is invited to review the short explanations of the qualitative research traditions and determine how the columns transfer to his or her own context.

Reference List

Bernstein, R. J. (1983). **Beyond Objectivism and Relativism**. Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press.

Dewey, (1984). **Types of Thinking**. New York: Philosophical Library.

Derrida, J. (1987). **The Post Card.** Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Evertson, C. M. & Green J. L. (1986). Observation as inquiry and method. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.). **Handbook of Research on Teaching** (3rd edition), (pp. 162-213).

Guba, E. G. & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). **Fourth Generation Evaluation**. Newbury Park, California: Sage.

Lather, P. (1986). Issues of validity in openly ideological research: Between a rock and a soft place. **Interchange**, 17(4), 63-84.

Lather, P. (1991). **Getting Smart: Feminist Research and Pedagogy with/in the Postmodern**. New York: Routledge.

Leiter, K. (1980). **A Primer on Ethnomethodology.** New York: Oxford University Press.

Lincoln, Y. S. & Guba, E. G. (1985). **Naturalistic Inquiry**. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Marshall, C. & Rossman, G. B. (1989). **Designing Qualitative Research.** Newbury Park, California: Sage.

Miller, D. L. (1973). **George Herbert Mead: Self Language and the World**. Chicago, IL: Univ. of Chicago Press.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). **Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods** (2nd ed.). Newbury Park: Sage.

Peshkin, A. (1988). In search of subjectivity-one's own. **Educational Researcher**. 17(7), 17-21.

Spradley, J. P. (1980). **Participant Observation**. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1990). **Basics of Qualitative Research**. Newbury Park, California: Sage.

Winner, L. (1977). **Autonomous Technology.** Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

DERRIDA, DECONSTRUCTION, AND EDUCATION POLICY ANALYSIS

Charles J. Fazzaro
University of Missouri-St. Louis

> The idea of an educated person held by a given era is always predicated on the basis of a theory of truth. [paraphrase]
>
> *Jacques Derrida*

Introduction

Since the Paris student uprisings of 1968, post-structural/postmodern (for the sake of brevity, hereafter *poststructural*) thought has gained considerable notice as a particularly enlightening approach to philosophical inquiry. In the 1980s poststructural inquiry found its way into discussions of American education policy. Michel Foucault and his "historical analytics," Jacques Derrida and his "deconstruction," and Jean-François Lyotard and his "language games" and "incredulity to metanarratives" are the three poststructural "philosophers" most often referenced in such discussions. This paper is an examination of Derrida's deconstruction and its implications for education policy analysis.

The paper is divided into four parts. The first part is an admittedly cryptic delineation of the fundamental differences between structuralism and poststructuralism. The second part is a biographical sketch of Derrida. The third part is an explication of the major aspects of Derrida's project that allows for his notion of deconstruction. The fourth and final part is a discussion of how Derrida's *deconstruction* can be used in education policy analysis.

Structuralism/Poststructuralism

The focus of structuralism is on the relationships--the *structure*--of elements in a totality. Poststructuralists do not deny the existence of structures, but they do question what legitimately can be concluded from any interpretations made of the relationships inherent in any structure, especially those of a non-physical nature. The division of totalities (or perhaps more accurately stated as "division for the purpose of totalizing") characterizes the nature of structuralism.[1]

The idea of division in Western thought goes back at least to Democritus (460-370 B.C.). The central idea Democritus inseminated into Western culture was that entities could be conceived of as assemblies of multiple components. This spawned the corollary that elements, even those that are not similar, might function more *efficiently* if totalized into an integrated unit--a system--than when they are independent of one another. This corollary lay relatively dormant in regards to social relations until about the seventeenth century when it found economic utility. It was realized at this time that radical linear, if not exponential increases in efficiency could be achieved through a division of labor. This discovery gave birth to the factory system to produce common goods that, up until then, were produced--from raw materials to finished product--by single craftsmen working independently.

The notion of "efficiency through division" manifested itself in the intellectual world of the seventeenth century when Descartes separated thought into *reason* and *unreason*. In short, he argued that new knowledge could be more efficiently discovered through reason. In the eighteenth century, Kant, who almost singlehandedly transformed the nature of Western thought, continued this idea of "efficiency through division" by separating metaphysical thought from scientific thought and dividing both knowledge and experience into categories or types.[2]

It can be argued that "efficiency through division" conditioned other important intellectual "discoveries" that ultimately shaped social, economic, and political thought. For example, the notion is centrally important to Darwin's evolution, Marx's economic determinism, M. A. Quetelet's conception of the "normal" man, and Ferdinand de Saussure's linguistics. But the notion spawned a second register of thought in what since has been called *structuralism*.

Structuralism goes beyond the notion of "efficiency through division" and argues that the locus of *meaning* is in the relationships between the elements that constitute a system, a *totality*. The joining of the notions of "efficiency through division" and "totality" (an interactive *system* of divided elements) is clearly illustrated in Claude Lévi-Strauss's "structural linguistics," which can be viewed as an extension of Saussure's earlier work. The basis of poststructural thought is in both the foundation and a critique of Saussurian linguistics.

The Foundation

Saussure conceived the linguistic *sign* both as a division and a totality. That is, the sign is the uniting of a sound-image (*signifier*) and a referent concept (*signified*). For Saussure, *meaning* within a sign system depends on two axes of structure, the syntagmatic and paradigmatic relationship of the linguistic elements--signifiers--that constitute the sign system; thus, *structuralism*.

Saussure's conception of the phonal-linguistic sign as a relation between a phonic *signifier* and a mental *signified* raised the question of the arbitrary nature of the sign. Saussure himself recognized that the choice of a particular signifier for a particular signified depends on the language system within which it resides.[3] What was important for Saussure were the ways in which a particular signifier differs from other elements in a system of signifiers.[4]

Derrida's Critique

Derrida's critique of Saussurian linguistics is centered on the privileged position that Saussure accorded *presence* in relation to meaning. That is, Saussure privileged the *phonal* sign (speech) over the *graphic* sign

(writing). Derrida believes that Saussure had little choice in the matter because he was thoroughly conditioned by the Western philosophical tradition that dominated most intellectual work at the time.[5] As an example of this Western philosophical tradition, Derrida quotes Rousseau, from his *Emile*:

> In the voice we have an organ answering to hearing; we have no such organ answering to sight, and we do not repeat colours as we repeat sounds. This supplies an additional means of cultivating the ear by practising the active and passive organs one with the other.[6]

As discourse, speech assumed a privileged position over writing because there is no physical or temporal distance between the speaker and the listener. That is, both speaker and listener are present when the signifier is uttered, insuring perfect understanding of the meaning of such discourse. Derrida refers to this belief in perfectly self-present meaning as *logocentrism*. He rejects logocentrism by arguing that speaking cannot be privileged over writing on the basis of presence versus absence or immediacy versus representation because speech, as much as writing, is already structured by both difference and distance.[7] In fact, Derrida calls into question all philosophical arguments that rely on binary oppositions for their justification. Having arrived at these conclusions, Derrida has since mounted a massive critique of structuralism through his technique of "deconstruction."

Who is Jacques Derrida?

Until the early 1980s Derrida was a *maître-assistant* in philosophy at the *École Normale Supérieure* in Paris. He presently is *Directeure d'Etudes* at the *Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales* in Paris. Derrida has been very popular on the American intellectual scene for many years and spends considerable time in the United States, having been a visiting professor at such institutions as Johns Hopkins, Yale, University of California-Irvine, and Cornell.

Born in Algiers in 1930, Derrida received his formal education in France and attended Harvard in 1956 and 1957. Like many of his French academic contemporaries, Derrida was active in the 1960s student intellectual movement in Paris. During this time he wrote critical reviews for *Tel Quel*, a popular avant-garde journal of that era.

His intellectual genius became apparent to the academic world when his *Edmund Husserl's "Origin of Geometry": An Introduction* was published in 1962.[8] By 1980 the impact of his ever lengthening publication record was so great that he was awarded the *doctorate d'État* in Paris. To date Derrida has written over twenty books and a virtual flood of other publications including essays, interviews, and prefaces.

What is Derrida's project?

At base, Derrida is concerned with the locus of *meaning*. In this regard, he believes that Western philosophy must be accountable for its own discourse. He comes to this conclusion because he believes that the Western world has accepted a particular view of truth, consciousness, and language. When Derrida disassembles (*deconstructs*) texts based on this view he argues that these texts lack the transcendent nature that they project.[9] If this is the case, then the conclusions of any discourse grounded in Western metaphysics must be suspect of having an anthropological-subjective nature and not a transcendental-objective one that such discourses promise.

In explaining his project of deconstruction, Derrida freely uses a variety of term such as *signifiers*, *signifieds*, *margins*, *arche writing*, *différance*, *trace*, and others. Although it would be very convenient to have a precise glossary of these terms at the ready, no such glossary could be developed. This is because the meanings of these terms never seem to remain completely fixed for Derrida but are constantly interchanged with each other depending on the particular texts he is deconstructing at any particular time. Nonetheless, at least partial definitions can be attempted as a beginning to understanding Derrida's work. For this discussion I will deal with only *deconstruction*, *différance* and *trace* as they relate to Derrida's definition of language as an *oriented* structure--"a system of oppositions of places and values."[10]

Deconstruction

In appraising written texts, Derrida turns structuralism in on itself. Structuralists claim that the meaning of a text is in the relationship (structure) of its constituent elements, it is in the *unity* of the text. Derrida takes them at their word and dissembles texts in order to test this claim. Derrida calls this strategy "deconstruction." David Seeley provides a description of deconstruction as clear and succinct as any.

> To deconstruct a text means to separate the various points of view contained within it, and to let them stand fully exposed with all of their presuppositions. When this is done, the contours of these building blocks appear so different that the original 'unity of the text' can be regarded only as having been an illusion.[11]

Différance

Perhaps the central most important aspect of Derrida's deconstruction is the recognition of what he calls *différance* (from the French verb *différer*, which means both "to differ" and "to defer").[12] *Différance* is what Derrida calls the formal play of differences within every "process of signification" (discursive act). Succinctly stated, Derrida argues that:

> 1. The debasement of writing by Western philosophers, including, for example Plato, Aristotle, Rousseau, Hegel, and Husserl, is linked to the practice of phonetic-alphabetic writing;[13]
>
> 2. Writing is used to represent speech, but at the same time it is considered to be less than of speech because it lacks the logocentric notion of the importance of *presence*;
>
> 3. "Phonologism is less a consequence of the practice of the alphebet in a given culture than a certain ethical or axiological *experience* of this practice";[14]
>
> 4. There can be no purely phonetic writing

because of the necessity of "spacing of signs, punctuation, intervals, the differences indispensable for the functioning of graphemes, etc";[15] thus

5. "The entire phonologist or logocentric logic becomes problematical. Its range of legitimacy becomes narrow and superficial";[16] but

6. This delimitation (5) is paramount if one wants to be able to account for Saussure's *principle of difference*, "which holds that an element functions and signifies, takes on or conveys meaning, only by referring to another past or future element in an economy of traces";[17] thus

7. The principle of difference compels us (1) to not privilege the phonic (temporal) while excluding the graphic (spatial) and (2) to consider every process of signification as a formal play of difference, that is, of *traces* [of meaning].[18]

The importance of *différance* to Derrida is significant for his deconstruction because it fully considers the locus of meaning. Derrida argues that nothing comes before *différance* and spacing; thus, "there is no subject who is agent, author, and master of *différance* that eventually and empirically can be overtaken by *différance*."[19] This means that *différance* accounts for both subjectivity and objectivity because the spacing acknowledged by *différance* "is temporization, the detour and postponement by means of which intuition, perception, consummation--in a word, the relationship to the present, the reference to a present reality, to a *being*--are always *deferred*."[20] This deferral is explained by the Saussurian "principle of difference" (that a particular signifier has meaning only in its synchronic relation to all other signifying elements in a linguistic sign system). If this is the case, then meaning can never escape the chain of signification that constitutes a language. Consequently for Derrida, meanings are not stable because nothing comes before *différance*, there is nothing outside the sign system on which meanings can be grounded; thus, there can be no "transcendental signified."[21]

By "transcendental signified" Derrida, and poststructuralists generally, take the position that nothing transcends (is outside of) *discourse* ("language in use");[22] thus, humans constitute their own realities through discourse. This notion is paramount for Foucault who, for example, reasoned that knowledge, because of its discursive nature, becomes power through discourse.[23]

Deconstruction and Policy Analysis

Derridian deconstruction is as much an attitude as it is a strategy for critique. It promotes closer reading and heightens ones perception of inconsistencies that might be present in narratives. Cleo Cherryholmes recognizes the importance of deconstructive reading by reminding us that:

> In important ways we are always trapped in our language, but its ambiguities and its possible applications present opportunities, spaces for new meanings and thought. Unless we seize these changes we lock our own cell, thereby collaborating in our own imprisonment.[24]

In the literature of education there is increasing acceptance that education, in particular the schooling function of education, is best understood as discourse.[25] If this is the case, then who controls the discourse that informs education policy controls education. Lyotard states the important nature of education policy in the following:

> If we accept the notion that there is an established body of knowledge, the question of its transmission, from a pragmatic point of view, can be subdivided into a series of questions. Who transmits learning? What is transmitted? To whom? Through what medium? In what form? With what effect? A [schooling] policy is formed by a coherent set of answers to these questions.[26]

The answer to each of these questions presupposes a *meaning*, or "truth." In America, meaning is reserved to the conscience of each individual; it is not to be sponsored by government.[27] *Ipso facto*, public education policies that deal with purely truth conditional issues must not be the domain of government. Government should only be involved with those education policies that help insure that schooling can be effected in a reasonably ordered manner. But for over a century government has broadened its influence and ultimate control of almost all categories of decisions that any system of education presupposes--content, methodology, resourses, and distribution.[28] Deconstruction can help raise issues of government intrusion into the Constitutionally impermissible domain of meaning.

Notes

[1]The idea of division for the purpose of totalizing can be thought of as the basis of Michel Foucault's justification for reading texts as an archaeological activity. See, Michel Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1972). Originally published in France in 1969 under the title *L'Archéologie du Savoir* by Éditions Gallimard.

[2]See Kant's *Critique of Judgement* (1790).

[3]Saussure made a distinction between natural language (*langage*), a particular language (*langue*) and speech (*parole*). For an elaborated discussion of these distinctions see, David Holdcraft, *Saussure: Signs, Systems, and Arbitrariness* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 19-46.

[4]Holdcraft, 93.

[5]Saussure died in 1913 and his book, *Cours de linguistique générale* (*Course in General Linguistics*) was not published until 1961. See, Ferdinand de Saussure, *Course in General Linguistics*, trans., Wade Baskin (London: Peter Owen, 1974).

[6]Jacques Derrida, *Of Grammatology*, trans., Gayatri Chakrawvorty Spivak (Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974), 97. Originally published in Frsnce in 1967 as *De la Grammatologie* by Le Editions de Minut.

[7]Barbara Johnson, trans., *Dissemination*, by Jacques

Derrida (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1981), ix. Originally published in France in 1972 as *La Dissémination* by Editions du Seuil.

[8]Edmund Husserl (1859-1938) was a German philosopher and the founder of the phenomenological movement in continental philosophy. The project of Husserl's phenomenology was to discover a universal philosophical method by describing, without any preconditions or assumptions, only directly observable phenomena. Husserl believed that everything that could not be directly observed could not be given to the consciousness; therefore, it could not be known for certain. In this sense, phenomenology attempts to discover the "laws" that structure of human experiences. Phenomenology was particularly important to the early development of existentialism.

[9]Gayatri Chakrawvorty Spivak, trans., *Of Grammatology*, by Jacques Derrida (Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974), xiii.

[10]Derrida, *Of Grammatology*, 216.

[11]David Seeley, The Institute for Antiquity and Christianity, Claremont Graduate School, Claremont, California, cited in *Bible Review*, Vol. IX, Number 3, June, 1993, p. 51.

[12]Johnson, ix.

[13]Jacques Derrida, *Positions*, trans., Alan Bass (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1981), 24-25. Originally published as *Positions* (Paris: Les Editions de Minuit, 1972).

[14]Derrida, *Positions*, 25.

[15]Derrida, *Positions*, 25-26.

[16]Derrida, *Positions*, 26.

[17]Derrida, *Positions*, 28-29.

[18]Derrida, *Positions*, 26.

[19]Derrida, *Positions*, 28-29.

[20]Derrida, *Positions*, 28-29.

[21]Derrida, *Positions*, 28-29.

[22]In this regard, for example, Michel Foucault would see discourse as the language expressed through practices. Thus discourse is different from the Saussurian *la langue*, the formal aspects of language and *la parole*, spoken language. Like languages, discourse expresses or communicates meanings and has its own rules of operating. As Foucault has argued, these rules are relative to the particular *episteme* within which the discourse takes place. The meanings conveyed by a discourse are embedded in the structural relations of the social, economic, and political institutions of a culture.

[23]Michel Foucault, "The Discourse on Language," Appendix to: Michel Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1972), 215-37. Originally published in France in 1971 as *L'ordre du discours* by Editions Gillimard.

[24]Cleo H. Cherryholmes, *Power and Criticism: Poststructural Investigations in Education* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1988).

[25]Cherryholmes

[26]Jean-François Lyotard, *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1984), 48.

[27]See, for example, *West Virginia State Board of Education v. Barnette*, Supreme Court of the United States, 1943, 319 U.S. 624, 63 S.Ct. 1178.

[28]Donna H. Kerr, *Educational Policy, Analysis, Structure, and Justification* (New York: Daniel McKay, 1976).

REFORM AND RECONSTRUCTION IN EDUCATION: COMMITMENT OR FAD

James Van Patten and James Bolding
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

Those of us who been in the field of education for decades have seen the ebb and flow of continuous cycles of educational movements. Few have lasted more than a few years, and even fewer have resulted in any lasting educational contributions. Change for its own sake has become common in education. Dewey (1949) once referred to the importance of quality in the change process.

> Mere flux, aimless and meaningless, starts at no definite point and arrives at nothing, amounts to nothing. Mere changes of quantity, all purely mechanical changes, are of this kind. They are like the shifting of the sands by the sea. They may be sensed, but they cannot be "noted" or understood... They are contemptible: 57.

Change for the sake of change often leads to reinventing the wheel. It leads to excessive costs and often results in poor teacher morale. Educators faced with excesses in changes seek to resist, circumvent, or avoid change. Frequently newly hired educational administrators push change as a central mission.

It is interesting to watch cycles of change within Universities. Administrations tend to follow fashionable trends like lemmings. One year the stress will be on research. The next year after student complaints reach legislators, the focus will shift to teaching. Astute administrators often combine interest areas by focusing on research in teaching. Currently emerging are calls for examining the management of higher educational systems in California and Oklahoma. In Arkansas as in other states, newly hired State School Superintendents implement various educational reforms and restructuring processes. All teachers, administrators, staffs of Arkansas public schools were required to take Madeline Hunter's P.E.T. program. All dutifully complied. Today little is heard of the reform program so highly touted earlier. Literature in the field of curriculum reveals the shortcomings of Madilyn Hunter's program which was not designed with the current buzzword *teacher empowerment* as a goal.

Dewey's (1949) call was for proactive change which becomes "significant of new possibilities and ends to be attained... it is associated with progress rather than lapse and fall." Educational reform and restructuring needs to be anchored in active participation and involvement of professional educators for effective results. The buzzwords *teachers as stakeholders* means teachers should gain a sense of ownership in their profession, school and community.

Classical Christian Tradition

A glimpse of the history of American education illustrates the need for reform movements based on commitments to improving the learning-teacher environment. In the 17th century Colonial Schools with whipping posts in classrooms operated on a Classical-Christian philosophy of education in which rote memorization, drill, external and internal discipline predominated. There was a place for everyone and everyone knew his place within the class society. Perennialism was seen in the universality, eternality and uniformity of educational aims, values and methods. Deviation from mandated cultural norms led to swift punishment. Moral and ethical conduct was part of the curriculum of every school. Each member of the society knew what was expected, and deviates were few. Authority of the clergy prevailed. Disorder in schools was swiftly corrected. Caning and boxing were part of teaching methods. Although boxing was banished from Harvard College in the 1700s.

Women who took issue with church authorities were disciplined, banished from the colony, or both. Ann Hutchinson of Massachusetts Bay Colony felt the power of Classical-Christian authority in her civil trial in 1637. Erickson (1966) noted that Ann Hutchinson, a dynamic intellect, took issue with reigning church authorities. In fact she felt that only two ministers in the commonwealth were familiar enough with the finer points of Puritan Religion to qualify for their jobs. Such dissension was viewed as intolerable.

Governor Winthrop represented the Puritan philosophy when he once explained that a woman of his acquaintance had become mentally ill as a result of reading too many books "for if she had attended her household affairs, and such things as belong to women, and had not gone out of her way and calling to meddle in such things as are proper for men, she had kept her wits, and might have improved them usefully and honorably in the place that God had set her." (p. 82). At Ann Hutchinson's trial, political to be sure, Thomas Dudley spoke for the prosecution:

> .... About three years ago we were all in peace. Mrs. Hutchinson from the time she came hath made a disturbance. ... She had vented divers of her strange opinions (even influencing Mr. Cotton who fortunately has repented)..But it now appears by this woman's meetings that Mrs. Hutchinson (has her own group of supporters). Now if all these things have endangered us as from the foundation, and if she in particular hath disparaged all our ministers in the land.... why, this is not to be suffered.... it being found that Mrs. Hutchinson ... hath disparaged all the ministers and hath been the cause of what is fallen out, why we must take away the foundation and the building will fall. (p. 94-95).

There was no room in colonial America for dissent, or questioning of those in authority. Mrs. Hutchinson's banishment from Massachusetts Colony reflected the narrowness of Puritan views. However, in every age we are all prisoners of the age in which we live. We cannot

interject 20th century values into the Puritan culture. As Erickson noted, Puritan punishment although harsh to us, was not so in view of their philosophical and ideological perspective.

> If a culprit standing before the bench is scheduled to spend eternity in hell, it does not matter very much how severely the judges treat him, for all the hardships and sufferings in the world will be no more than a faint hint of the torments awaiting him in the hereafter....(In Europe) felons were sometimes sentenced to burn at the stake in the theory that this would represent an apt introduction to the fires of hell. (p. 190).

From Classical-Christian to Modern Realism

Breaking the hold of the Authoritarian Tradition in American Education did not come easily. By the middle of the 18th century, there was an anti authoritarian influence in America. It reflected a period of change as the Colonies broke from Britain. The transition was not easy. Thomas Paine represented the trend toward anti authoritarianism with his *Age of Reason* in 1795. Paine's vision grew out of the ideas of the French Revolution as he saw a world without kings or priests, injustice or fear. Benjamin Franklin was influenced by the pre-revolutionary ideas in France (May 1976). In his phamphets and parables he hammered away at religious dogmatism, especially predestination. Franklin attacked the Calvinists with writings such as:

> A Man of Words and not of Deeds
> Is Like a Garden full of Weeds. (May 1976:126).

The French Revolution however frightened many. Noah Webster (1758-1843) like others during the 18th century was torn between traditionalism and a new movement for individual autonomy and freedom. He was frightened at the cost of the French Revolution turning more conservative, leading him to constant criticism of Jefferson's populism. Webster, an essentialist, clung to both traditions but stood firmly in the camp of Washington, Adams and Hamilton for a strong federal government. Webster played the role of an educational reformer with his *Blueback Speller and the American Dictionary* dedicated to nationalism and social unity through common language. He stood four square against corporal punishment.

Webster Americanized the British language providing a basis for love of virtue, liberty and learning (Cremin 1970). Rollins (1980) noted that Webster used the *Spelling Book (Blueback Speller)* to espouse the cause of the revolution and the ability of man to perfect himself through reason. Pulliam (1991) notes that Webster felt no legislature should ignore the needs of free schools in which all American children could learn the virtues of liberty, just laws, morality, and patriotism.

Rollins (1980) noted that as capitalism took hold, the theology of New England softened, but the values and precepts on which theology was based continued. Work, thrift, frugality, honesty, abhorrence of extravagance and idleness, and morality were honored values noted by Rollins. Schools during this period continued with rote memorization, drill and Socratic dialectic, but with a much lessened authoritarianism and harsh discipline.

Horace Mann (1796-1859) was an educational reformer committed to restructuring schools to improve the quality of instruction, administration, and teacher training. His life was devoted to the common school, state supported and publicly controlled. His lifelong work toward democracy in education was designed to replace the paupers and apprentices' schooling provided by English Poor Laws. Like Noah Webster, Mann viewed the school as an institution for social unity. Mann saw the school as a unifying force that would serve as a *melting pot* for immigrants and other diverse elements in society. He was committed to a concept of *a Stewardship Theory of Wealth* wherein those economically more fortunate had a moral and ethical obligation to support the schooling of those in need of support (Gutek 1970). Katz (1968) noted that Mann stressed the natural right of a child to an education. Society had a duty, acting as a trustee... to assure the fulfillment of a child's rights. If parents failed or were removed, it was the clear duty "of the society at large... the government... to step in and fill the parent's place." (p.43.) Mann used his twelve annual reports to the Massachusetts legislature to encourage the growth and development of the tax supported public school. A committed educational reformer, he encouraged restructuring public school policies and aims.

Experimentalism Revisited

John Dewey (1959-1951) a committed educational reformer whose ideas led to school restructuring, broke from the perennialism, idealism, and classical realism of the Classical Christian Tradition. Through his prolific writings, he created a vision of schools as miniature societies that reflected the issues, concerns and problems of the larger society. Dewey sought schools where students were involved, doing, undergoing, creating, innovating, imagining, investigating, and constructing. Interaction between pupils and teachers; teachers and administrators, schools and communities, Dewey found, of infinitely more value than rote memorization in schools with seats bolted to the floor designed only for listening pupils. His theory of inquiry developed a process of thinking from defining a problem, observing the conditions surrounding the problem, formulating hypotheses to solve the problem, elaborating possible consequences of acting on alternative hypotheses, and actively testing hypotheses to see which alternative best solved the problem. (Butts and Cremin 1959.)

Viewing education as life not preparation for life, Dewey sought a school where teachers, administrators and students were stakeholders in an exciting learning venture. Each would use the others as human resources for problem solving. Standing at an era of transition from agrarian to urban culture, Dewey sought to expand the concept of a people centered educational system where change was to be treasured and growth honored. He saw the importance of integrating theory and practice in education:

> As long as the isolation of knowledge and practice holds sway, this division of aims and dissipation of energy, of which the state of education is typical will persist. The effective condition of integration of all divided purposes and conflicts

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

of belief is the realization that intelligent action is the sole ultimate resource of mankind in every field whatsoever (Dewey 1929).

The journey of educational reform does not stand isolated from events in society. Jeffersonian and Jacksonian Democracy were reflected in the changing tides of meritocracy and egalitarianism. Periodic wars to end all wars effected educational reform as witnessed by the G.I. Bill of 1944 for returning servicemen and women. The ever present ebbs and flow of anti-intellectualism is reflected in the public perception of education. Arkansas' teacher testing is one such example. It helped to serve as a political road for Bill Clintons eventual election as President of the United States. Recent studies of the results of Arkansas' teacher testing and reform reveal student achievement about the same as before the state's massive efforts.

Drake (1986) cautioned about the dangers of anti-intellectualism and reductionism. He noted the political involvement in textbook decisions. Criticizing education comes from many sources. As Hullfish (1955) noted:

> The substance of attacks made upon public education varies from time to time. The purpose, however, is unchanging. Always the intent is restriction: restriction of activities, of books, of methods of teaching, of financial outlay, of ideas, of whatever promises to take the schools beyond the control of limited and limiting ideas held by the critics.

The standard cries have been to get back to the fundamentals, to cut out the frills, to return to discipline, to emphasize competition, ... and always, even when the spotlight is turned in other directions, to cut down the tax rate (Hullfish 1955).

Educational Fadism: 1980s -1990s

The Critics of Education

The Professionals:

We started our paper by noting the current move to explore higher education management systems in California and at Oklahoma State University. Reform movements of the 1980s from the *Nation At Risk* forward have often included the same criticism of education that William Bagley had in his *Essentialism* of 1938. Then and now the chief cause for concern is how to have our educational system geared to turning out students who can compete effectively with other nations in the international markets. Then and threatening the survival of Democracy.

Currently there are few calls for spiritual values as there were in 1642. Then there were few calls for interpersonal skills and social reform so prevalent in recent times. Calls for character building, for teaching moral and ethical conduct and values, will once again be in vogue as the nation is faced with random acts of teen age violence, suicide and other forms risk behavior. Thus we will have a new educational reform and restructuring.

First Wave of Reform:

The *Nation at Risk* ushered in an era of hyperbole. The report indicated that the state of education in the United States was worse than if we had been defeated in a war. As usual in most commission make-ups, few if any front line troops - public school teachers and administrators were among committee members. The same historic themes predominated--more effort, more discipline, increased subject matter, longer school days, and better evaluation systems. *Action for Excellence* 1983; *Investing in Our Children: Business and the Public Schools*, 1985, *Who Will Teacher Our Children* 1985, *Time for Results* 1986 followed with variation on the same themes.

Second Wave of Reform Reports:

A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century 1986, *American 2000: An Education Strategy* 1991; *Horace's School: Redesigning the American High School*, 1992 and *A Shared Vision: Policy Recommendations for Linking Teacher Education to School Reform*, 1993 --all stressed various restructuring concepts including increased attention to measuring student outcomes. Many of these reports are based on business and industrial models such as Frederick Taylor's *Scientific Management* of the 1920s and 30s. New forms of measuring productivity are continually emerging. An interesting popular one currently in vogue is *Total Quality Management.* Although the literature on the topic reveals little or indifferent success when the concept is applied, books, articles, pamphlets on TQM are being turned out in great numbers. Those ever ready for new fads are giving workshops seminars and institutes on *TQM*. Many of our faculty are attending workshops on the subject sponsored by our state's and the nation's largest chicken producer, Tyson Co. of Springdale, Arkansas.

The Lay Critics:

"Soap and schooling are not as sudden as a massacre, but are more deadly in the long run," said Mark Twain. His opinion of schooling is matched by Margaret Mead's "My Grandmother wanted me to get an education, so she kept me out of school," and Ralph Waldo Emerson's response to Horace Mann's lecture in 1839 crusading for the public school. Emerson said; "We are shut in schools--for ten or fifteen years, and come out at last with a bellyful of words and do not know a thing (Whitman 1964). One time Thomas Jefferson said that if he had a problem to solve he would rather trust a ploughman than a professor of philosophy.

Summary

We have just concluded our faculty plan days with the largest number and most extensive reports about evaluation, promotion, retention procedures in the 22 plus year history of our work at Arkansas. This situation prevails throughout the nation's educational systems (See Cooper 1990). Public school teachers are facing the same intense review of evaluation procedures and methods to measure student outcomes mandated by the legis-

lature.

The Bracey and Sandia (1991, 1993) reports suggest that the criticism of our educational system is based on faulty data, misinterpretation of the data, and outright dissemination of misinformation. Authors of both reports have been penalized by their supervisors for suggesting that many reform reports of the past 15 years are inaccurate.

As many articles in our current literature show, the multitude of reform reports have yielded few positive results. New studies are even now being done to determine why reform reports and restructuring attempts have failed. Katz (1968) has pointed out the danger for educators as various reforms pass from fashion:

> One danger..is disenchantment. Educators have always been too optimistic, especially in periods of reform. Repeatedly, we have been asked to believe that education would usher in a new and better society. (p. 216.)

Goodman (1983) has noted there are *Persistent Problems in Education.* These include What Education is of Most Worth? What Education is Basic? What Values and Beliefs Should Be Taught? How Shall We Deal With Individual Differences? How Shall Teachers be Selected, Educated, and Rewarded? Reform reports and restructuring will not answer these questions. There needs to be a social consensus from our increasingly diverse culture to even tentatively respond to these perennial questions. Meanwhile the best we can do is deal with the multitude of increasingly lengthy reports, surveys, job description, reorganization charts, with a sense of history knowing that those who issue these massive missiles have to create and maintain their jobs.

Historically committed reformers such as Webster, Mann, Dewey have improved our educational systems. Since the 1980s with less knowledge of the real world of the public schools, reformers have not been able to influence education and educators noticeably. A persistent theme of recent reform reports, has been that as prisoners of our age, "we are all sensitive to implications and ramifications of political correctness". Also a perusal of the composition of the various 1980s and 1990s educational reform committees and commissions bring to mind an old Chinese saying: "The magistrates are allowed to set fire but the ordinary people aren't even allowed to light their lamps."

References

Bagley, W.C. (1938). "An Essentialist's Platform for the Advancement of American Education", *Educational Administration and Supervision.* Volume 26: 241-256.

Bracey, Gerald W. (1991). " Why Can't They Be Like We Were?" *Kappan,* October: 104-117.

Butts, R. Freeman and Cremin, Lawrence A. (1959). New York: Henry Holt and Co: 343-347.

Cooper, Jed Arthur (1990). *Panguitch Professor: An Autobiography.* Denton, Texas: Panguitch Publications: 207-208.

Cremin, Lawrence A. (1970). *American Education: The Colonial Experience1607-1783.* New York: Harper and Row.

Dewey, John (1957). *Reconstruction in Philosophy.* New York: Beacon Press: 116.

Dewey, John (1929). *The Quest for Certainty.* New York: G.P. Putman and Sons: 252.

Drake, William (1986). *How to Achieve the Life That Is Good to Live.* Austin, Texas: Drake: 48.

Erickson, Kai T. (1966). *Wayward Puritans A Study in the Sociology of Deviance.* New York: John Wiley & Sons: 58-190.

Gutek, Gerald (1970). *An Historical Introduction to American Education.* New York: Thomas Y. Crowell: 54-58.

Huelskamp, Robert M. (1993). "Perspectives on Education in America: The Sandia Report". *Kappan,* May: 718-721.

Katz, Michael B. (1968). *The Irony of Early School Reform.* Boston: Beacon Press: 43.

May, Henry F. (1976). *The Enlightenment in America.* New York: Oxford University Press: 124.

Rollins, Richard M. (1980). *The Long Journey of Noah Webster.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press: 17-37.

Van Patten, James (1976). "Unity and Diversity in American Education," *The American Experience,* Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press.

Whitman, Walt (1964). "Democratic Vistas," in *Prose Works.* New York: New York University Press: 381.

MIND, CHARACTER, AND THE DEFERRAL OF GRATIFICATION: AN RX FOR EDUCATIONAL CHANGE

Louis Goldman
Wichita State University

Perhaps the most valuable result of all education is the ability to make yourself do the thing you have to do, when it ought to be done, whether you like it or not. It is the first lesson that ought to be learned, and however early a man's training begins, it is probably the last lesson he learns thoroughly.

- Thomas Huxley -
Talk to Working Men's Club of London

I. A New Paradigm: Medicine and Education

Educators would do well to heed the quiet revolution that is taking place in our approach to medicine in this century. There has been an increasing emphasis on holistic treatment: not only looking at mind and body together, but at their social and environmental context. Not just responding to symptoms but searching for causes. Not too long ago most doctors viewed their role curatively. Patients would develop illnesses which would then be treated with medicines, surgery or other therapies. Only on rare occasions such as epidemics would physicians alter their reactive posture of addressing the peculiar ills of individual patients. Then they might realize that tuberculosis was related to congested housing conditions, or that lung cancer was related to certain occupations such as coal mining or life-styles that included smoking cigarettes. As epidemiological and comparative studies multiplied we were astounded that most illnesses do not occur at the same rate in all populations. In some nations colon cancer is virtually non-existent; in others heart disease is rare. Social class correlates highly with other diseases, as does the type and severity of mental disorders. Inexorably, physicians are coming to the realization that their bag of tricks are often an impotent, last-ditch effort to restore health and cure the patient. Of far greater importance are the preventive measures the patient takes in developing a more healthy life-style and the vigilance of public health officials in ridding the environment of contaminants and other lethal elements. Highway fatalities may be reduced somewhat by having better trauma centers in hospitals, it is true, but they would plummet by the elimination of drunken drivers. The installation of concrete dividers on the Kansas Turnpike resulted in the most dramatic decline of all.

We are finally coming to the conclusion that our health does not depend upon an omnipotent God-like doctor with a pharmacy of "magic bullets," but on the cooperative efforts of individuals who assume more responsibility for themselves, public health officials and other environmental scientists, and the physician. Though some people die or become more ill because of medical malpractice or inadvertent iatrogenesis, more often the blame should be borne by the patient, or by a failed public policy which created environmental hazards.

What I am suggesting here is that education, like medicine, is concerned with the well-being or health of individuals, albeit their mind and character rather than their bodies. And I am suggesting also that most educators are still tied to the obsolete model of curative medicine, that they have not paid sufficient attention to the role of personal responsibility for education nor to the environmental and public policy factors that contribute to educational "health" or educational failure. Too many of our programs have merely tried to alleviate pain without achieving a cure; we have provided crutches without healing the leg, and the leg will eventually atrophy as it becomes dependent on the crutch. Thus doctors — and teachers — may become part of the problem rather than part of the solution. When confronted with ignorance (or learning disabilities) or with discipline problems or antisocial behavior, educators reach for their bag of remedies or surgical procedures (*e.g.*, expulsions). Rarely do they try to alter the life-style of the student or improve the environment or get to those public policies or social values which undermine the individual's educational health. Even more rarely do they understand what are the essential conditions or prerequisites for the development of intelligence and good character. Yet, inexorably I believe, we must abandon the curative model and do these things if we are ever to substantially improve our educational efforts.

II. Mind

From time to time throughout history we have misconstrued the purpose of education. Many Greeks and Romans thought it was to create good leaders or good orators. The 1918 report on the Cardinal Principles of Education thought it was to help individuals become whole persons and succeed in personal, family, social and vocational undertakings. Our present notion is that education should make our nation more economically competitive.

For the most part, however, we have usually believed that education should make us smarter or more rational, should foster mind, intelligence and wisdom. Then, and only then, would we become good leaders or parents or competitive workers. We have usually gotten it right and have put first things first. But what is mind, intelligence and wisdom and how do we get it?

To begin, let us recognize that we generally attribute these characteristics to human beings preeminently and to other animals marginally if at all. How, then, do we differ from animals (and still lower organisms)?

First and foremost, all organic life responds to stimuli. Plants are heliotropic, bending toward the sun or other sources of light. The Venus Fly-Trap responds to touch and closes around an intrusive insect. A dog barks

when a stranger approaches. Our eyes blink when a movement is made toward them. Adrenalin is released into our blood when we perceive danger. The lower the form of organic life, the more inflexible is this pattern of stimulus and response.

For most humans, at many times in their lives, however, the response is not fixed, immediate or biologically determined. Then the response may be delayed, may be a learned or a reasoned response, which may be more appropriate to the stimulus than one which was simply triggered. If we are struck, we have been admonished not to strike back, but to turn the other cheek, to return evil not with evil, but with good. But how is this possible? How can we transcend our animal or biological nature?

Two things are necessary. First we must learn to not respond immediately to stimuli whether they be external (environmental or interpersonal) or internal (such as pangs of hunger, the need to urinate or defecate, sexual impulse). Deferring our response to stimuli and not obtaining immediate gratification allows us to consider alternative responses. Because the mother's nipple is not immediately available to respond to the hunger stimulus of the infant, the infant must discover that his gratification can be obtained only through the mediation of crying. The emergence of humans as tool- and language-using animals may well be bound up with this early experience.

A second condition that is required for us to break the stimulus-response pattern of organic life is a realization, an awareness, a mindfulness if you will, that there are other possibilities for action or response than those which are instinctually or biologically presented to us. This means that in some sense we know that there is more to our world than our perceived here and now; that there is a there and a then; that our deeds have contexts; that life is not a succession of isolated events (of stimulus and response) but that there is some kind of interconnectiveness to everything. But how do we transcend the immediacy of our sense perceptions and become mindful of a wider reality? The question of how we can go, in Bruner's phrase, "beyond the information given," of how we can attend to, or be mindful of, a reality which we are not sensing is ultimately a question of the relation between minds and brains, and perhaps we would be wise to quote William James on this point, and leave it at that: "The relations of a mind to its own brain are of a unique and utterly mysterious sort."[1] But before we accede to the mystery of the relationship we should attempt some sort of clarification.

While there may, indeed, be some thing which we call mind we would be well advised to emphasize the activity or process of attending to, or being mindful of, something which we are not currently perceiving. Through memory we can be aware or mindful of that which has happened or was perceived, and through imagination we can be aware or mindful of that which may happen or be perceived. Now, both memory and imagination are intricately related with abstract symbols. On the one hand we can say that we remember or recall things only when the past, by some unconscious process, has been encoded and stored in words or symbols and then retrieved, or that imagination is a kind of symbolic extrapolation of the past. That memory is dependent on symbolism or language largely explains what has been called by Ernst Schachtel[2] "childhood amnesia," our difficulty in remembering anything prior to our acquisition of language. On the other hand, we can say that symbols or words are concentrates or abstractions from our past experiences or are plans of action for the future. And it is here, of course, in our ability to create abstract symbols or to grasp universals when all our experience has been of individual sensations that James' "utter mystery" reenters the scene.

Nevertheless, we have made some progress. Now that we have come to see the power of symbols or ideas to enable us to attend to the world, or to be mindful of reality without having sense perceptions of it, we can agree with John Dewey that "mind is the symbolic functioning of events." With mind, we can entertain and test hypotheses or alternative responses to stimuli without going through long and tedious series of trials and errors.

Pedagogically, it follows that in addition to developing students' ability to defer immediate gratification we ought to simultaneously enlarge their total conceptual apparatus of symbols, words and ideas. It should be obvious that this enlargement will involve a long, and at times tedious, process of study or enculturation which may yield very little immediate gratification.

III. Character

Along with the growth of mind, the development of character is a pre-eminent aim of education. To a certain extent we might say that mind is the foremost concern of formal education in the schools, while character is the foremost concern of informal education in the family, in the church and other institutions, as well as in the schools as part of the "hidden curriculum."

Included in our conception of character education are those things which have fallen under such rubrics as moral education, values education, citizenship or civic or political education. Central to these concerns is the way we relate to other human beings, how we ought to behave as members of a group, and what values are required for good or appropriate behavior.

An obvious assumption of character education is that, unlike ants or bees who are exquisitely programmed with instincts to function as parts of the hill or hive, humans are relatively devoid of such equipment. The more one is convinced that humans are devoid of all of these social instincts, indeed, the more one is convinced that humans are sinfully egocentric by nature, the more one is likely to attend to character education. Hence, Calvinistic societies like our own have always emphasized character education.

Perhaps no one has expressed the tension in the moral life of the individual (or the central fact of character education) better than the English philosopher, Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679). For him it is a law of nature that all men have the right of self-preservation and may use any means to achieve this. We may take another's property or even his life if we believe this adds to our security and preservation. But all men are by nature equal, says Hobbes, and they may take our property and life to ensure their preservation. In this war of "each against everyone" there is "continual fear, and danger of violent death; and the life of man, solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short."[3] There will be no agriculture for fear others will harvest what we sow, no industry for fear others will profit from our labors; in short, civilization

will not be possible.

But Hobbes believes that there is another law of nature which is to seek peace and "to lay down (his) right to all things; and be contented with so much liberty against other men, as he would allow other men against himself," a restatement of the Golden rule.

Darwin, Freud and others have reformulated Hobbes' abstract political philosophy in a biological and psychological frame of reference. For Darwin, all life seeks to maintain and extend itself and in the struggle for existence there will be a survival of the fittest. For Freud, men's basic nature, the id, consists of desires, impulses, instincts or drives which seek fulfillment or satisfaction. Tragically, perhaps, our desires may come into conflict with other people's desires, which results in warfare or social disruption. In agreement with Hobbes, Freud believes that individuals must "lay down (their) right" to satisfaction if others do the same so that we may live in a civilized manner. With civilization there will always be discontents.

Perhaps nothing illustrates our situation better than our traffic laws. We all want to reach our destinations as rapidly as possible, without delays or stops. But your speeding across an east-west street imperils my desire to speed down a north-south street to my destination, and vice-versa. We both are willing, however, to surrender some of our freedom to reach our destination quickly in exchange for a greater assurance or security that we will indeed reach it. We tacitly agree to "lay down our right" to maximum satisfaction, to ensure partial satisfaction. So as we all speed through life we are all in constant need of security that the will of others does not unduly interfere with ours, as they are that ours does not unduly interfere with theirs. Hence, we devise systems or codes of behavior which include customs, manners, morals and laws to enable us to live together in the most mutually satisfactory way. And we need to educate our young to obey these codes, to claim their rights and to honor and respect the rights of others.

The practical problem in all of this is in engineering a disposition to "lay down one's right" to unlimited property and satisfactions; to curb one's desires or appetites; to repress one's socially disruptive drives. Or, to use the term which we have previously used when we discussed education of the mind, we need to learn to defer immediate gratification.

The state, as Aristotle pointed out,[4] has a compelling interest in the education of the young since its function is to harmonize competing interests of individuals and factions. The self-discipline necessary for good citizenship has usually, in the past, been part of the educational role of the family, church and schools. To the extent, however, that these institutions fail to instill sufficient self-discipline, the state will usually intercede with restrictive legislation; oftentimes Draconian. To the extent it does not, it risks moral and social chaos.

IV. Deferring Gratification

We speak of deferring gratification only in a context in which it is possible to achieve gratification. People in a nation gripped by famine cannot be said to control their appetites or defer gratification. They have no choice; they are simply starving. If we choose to fast or to diet, though food is available, we are indeed deferring gratification. The question then arises as to how and why we can get ourselves and others to defer gratification when we could do otherwise.

We can distinguish between needs and wants. Our most basic needs are biological. We need to breathe, but can defer this for only a few seconds. We need to eat and drink and can defer this for many days. We also need to urinate and defecate, but can defer this for only a short time. Very early in life we begin to be toilet trained. We begin to be nursed less and less on demand, and increasingly on schedule. Later we are told not to eat between meals (though current medical opinion is contrary to this) and we are alternately rewarded with the approval of our parents when we defer gratification and are punished by their disapproval when we seek immediate gratification. Ultimately we have the choice of deriving pleasure from being biologically gratified or a greater pleasure by being socially approved; or conversely the choice of experiencing the discomfit of not being biologically gratified or the greater discomfit of being socially disapproved. Of course approval and disapproval or reward and punishment usually operate concurrently.

Now the deferral of gratification of our biological needs is necessarily short-lived. No one has ever suggested that we defer breathing. Everyone recognizes that we can have but limited control over urination and defecation. With respect to food and drink we did, indeed, at one time attempt to defer consumption to a standard three meals a day. This has altered appreciatively in recent decades and we are now encouraged to eat and drink more continuously throughout the day. Faculty and students often sip beverages in our classrooms. Today it is not deferral which is emphasized, but moderation (a theme we will return to shortly.)

In contrast to needs or necessities which demand fulfillment, we speak of wants, desires and luxuries, those things we can live without. Of course, there are at least two interpretations of this, the biological and the social. From the biological perspective fashionable clothing, indoor plumbing and television sets are not necessities. The social perspective, however, holds that if something is widely consumed, or perhaps even reasonably consumed, it does not count as a luxury or want, but is, indeed, a need. Thus, owning radios, TV's, toasters, a varied wardrobe, an automobile, etc. are needs because in our society they are universally consumed. Exceeding the normal range of consumption or consuming unreasonably is the social definition of luxury. Having a few pair of shoes is a need; Imelda Marcos' 2,000 pair is clearly a luxury.

The consequences of the social definition of needs are far-reaching and disastrous.

In the biological framework of interpretation there are a few needs which cannot be denied or long deferred; everything else are luxuries or wants. Of those which are attainable, deferral of gratification is possible and may be desirable. Those which are unattainable are fantasies or dreams. In the social framework, many luxuries or wants of the biological framework are converted into needs as they are attained by large numbers of people. Now regarded as needs they are perceived to be demanding of fulfillment. Only those wants which are idiosyncratic or are not widely attained are deemed to fall into the class of those satisfactions which can be legitimately deferred.

Obviously, as our standard of living has improved at

an accelerating rate over the past few centuries, the range of those "legitimate" gratifications has enlarged and our willingness to defer gratification has diminished. Increasingly, people come to feel that they are "deserving" or are "entitled" to have their so-called needs met, although these needs were luxuries only a short time ago. Stanford University economist Tibor Scitovsky says that "consumption is addictive: each luxury quickly becomes a necessity, and a new luxury must be found... Needs are socially defined, and escalate with the rate of economic progress."[5] This is not a new insight. Benjamin Franklin once wrote about money that "the more a man has, the more he wants. Instead of filling a vacuum, it makes one."

The problems with this dynamic are many. One is that as more and more people come to feel that they are entitled to more and more fulfillments, strains are put on our economy and our resources. The enlargement of these satisfactions and consumptions is often non-sustainable: our needs (desires) become infinite while our resources remain finite. Secondly, and more to the point, as desires or wants get converted to needs, the whole question of the deferral of gratification becomes muddled and the legitimacy of the idea of deferring gratification gets questioned, or in some quarters, ridiculed.

At this point we need to understand that gratification relates not only to appetites, but to the emotions as well. Feelings of love and anger clamor for satisfaction as well as feelings of thirst and hunger. The society that legitimizes the satisfaction of most appetites (wants) will have difficulty in restricting the expression of many emotions. If the individual libido is regarded as sovereign, it is a short step to the anarchy of the supremacy of the ego, and to the post-modern nihilistic relativism of the super-ego.

V. What Research Reveals

The overall thrust of the above analysis of the relationship between mind and character and the deferral of gratification has been amply reinforced by a century of research. In The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism, Max Weber[6] showed that within Germany, the more emotionally controlled Protestant population had higher levels of educational attainment and management positions than the Catholic population. Alan Witt's research in 1988 in the U.S. showed Protestants still scoring significantly higher than Catholics on a delay of gratification measure.[7]

In 1948 Allison Davis showed that social class differences were largely a function of the ability to defer gratification. "In slum groups," he wrote, "both children and adults are permitted far more gratification of their sexual responses and of their rage responses. This...extends into most of the basic areas of adolescent behavior in the lower class."[8] The famous Kinsey reports[9] which followed Davis corroborate his assertion with respect to sexual behavior, and all of our contemporary data shows that the lower classes have earlier and more frequent sexual encounters than the middle classes. The famous Coleman Report[10] showed a greater internal "locus of control" as one ascends the social class structure.

Recent studies describe subjects with high ability to delay gratification as interested in intellectual matters, having higher I.Q.'s, being academically competent, verbally fluent, rational, attentive and planful. Emotionally they cope better with frustration and stress and have greater ego resiliency and ego control. Socially, they are more responsible, productive, ethically consistent and cheat less.[11]

VI. A Brief History of the Deferral of Gratification

The usage of the term "deferral (or delay) of gratification" is fairly recent; the early Greeks tended to use the term "temperance" (sophrosyne) or moderation while Biblical usage tends toward "self-control." In all instances, of course, we are urged to master our lust and gluttony, but also to restrain our anger, pride and arrogance.

Homer, the great "Teacher of the Greeks," essentially organizes his two great epics around the themes of intemperance and temperance. The mythical origin of the Trojan War, which is the concern of The Iliad, is the so-called Judgment of Paris, wherein the Trojan prince, Paris, favors the goddess Aphrodite (lust) over Athena (wisdom) and Hera (marriage, family and womanhood). His lust is directed at Helen, the wife of King Menelaus, whom he abducts to Troy. (He is now guilty of the sins of lust and covetousness.) The anger and pride of the Greeks are now aroused, and a grand alliance is formed by Agamemnon with Achilles, Ajax, Nestor, Odysseus and other chieftains to reclaim Helen and punish the Trojans (and, as some historians suggest, to plunder Troy and gain an advantage in trading with Black Sea settlements). The action of The Iliad occurs near the end of the 10-year war, and is organized, as the opening line of the book tells us, around the wrath or anger of Achilles.

The various Greek leaders all had captured Trojan women as concubines, and circumstance comes to require that Agamemnon releases his to her father, or great misfortune will befall the Greek warriors. Achilles urges that this be done for the common good, but this enrages Agamemnon who is "filled black to the brim with anger." (Il. I, 103) He consents to relinquish the girl, but only if she is replaced, "lest I only among the Argives goes without, since that were unfitting" (Il. I, 118-119). Agamemnon's anger is now compounded with pride, and Achilles provokes him further by claiming that he is the "greediest for gain of all men" (Il. I, 122) with his "mind forever on profit." (Il. I, 149) Agamemnon pulls rank on Achilles and to show him "how much greater I am than you," (Il. I, 186) takes Achilles' concubine to replace his. Achilles, the greatest of warriors, in now so angered in turn that he vows to withdraw from the fighting rather than aid Agamemnon.

This outpouring of pride, anger, covetousness and perhaps envy and lust sets the stage for subsequent events, including that prophesied by Achilles that "By such acts of arrogance he (Agamemnon) may even lose his own life" (Il. I, 205). He does indeed die, as does Achilles and most of the other great warriors, Greek and Trojan, all victims of the unrestrained impulses of men and women like Paris, Helen, Agamemnon and Achilles.

But there is one man who is characterized by restraint and wisdom, who is "the equal of Zeus in counsel" (Il. II, 169) and that is Odysseus. In The Odyssey we see how he prevails, in contrast to most of his comrades who have fallen. Homer tells us repeatedly that Odysseus is "beyond all other men in mind" (Od. I, 65). As we might

expect, he is the favorite of the goddess Athena who tells him she will stand by him "because you are fluent, and reason closely, and keep your head always" (Od. XIII, 332). The prophet Teiresias tells Odysseus he will survive "if you can contain your own desire" (Od. XI, 105). In the fascinating, engrossing variety of adventures that befalls him he manifests these qualities of self-mastery. He resists the temptations of the Lotus Eaters and the Sirens and the promise of immortal bliss with Circe and Calypso. He is hit on the shoulder with a footstool that is thrown at him by his enemy Antinoös, yet he will not be provoked "but he shook his head in silence" (Od. XVII, 465) and later an ox hoof is hurled at him (Od. xx, 299) but he withholds his reaction for a more propitious time. He is master of his emotions as well as his appetites and comments from time to time that "for the sake of the cursed stomach people endure hardships" (Od. XV, 344) and "my wretched belly, that cursed thing, who bestows many evils on man" (Od. XVII, 473).

In The Iliad Agamemnon "claims to be the best of the Achaians" (Il. II, 82) but throughout The Odyssey, Odysseus unhesitantly reiterates that Achilles is "far the greatest of the Achaians" (XI, 478). It is clear, however, that Homer believes otherwise. Odysseus is the best of the Achaians.

And this is the greatest lesson that Homer teaches. True, many Greeks learned other lessons — how to speak and write effectively, how to worship the gods, how to behave according to the values and customs of their society and, perhaps most influentially, how important it was to strive for excellence as did the heroes of times past. Glaucus was told by his father "to be always among the bravest, and hold my head above others, not shaming the generation of my fathers, who were the greatest men..." (Il. VI, 208). And Achilles was told "to be always best in battle and pre-eminent beyond all others" (Il. XI, 783). But it was the temperance of Odysseus that was the ideal to be emulated.

From this Homeric temperance or sophrosyne, which can be shown to contrast or conflict with the implied arrogance or hubris of the hero who strives to be the best, comes the tension of the Apollonian versus the Dionysian. Pindar and then Aeschylus insist that men should know their limits; this is the meaning of "know thyself." And sophrosyne also comes to mean "Nothing in excess." At the end of the Oresteia, sophrosyne is conceived as a means between tyranny (suppression) and anarchy (lawlessness).

In Plato sophrosyne is mostly defined as the control of the appetites, the arete or excellence of the producing class. But Plato at other times makes it virtually synonymous with justice and at other times with wisdom. Aristotle's notion of moderation or the Golden Mean is a restatement of temperance or sophrosyne. The Hellenistic philosophical schools rely heavily on the concept. Clearly, volumes can, and have, been written on the Greek notion of temperance.

From the other pillar of Western civilization we have similar notions. The Book of Proverbs is especially replete with such nuggets of wisdom as these:

"He who is slow to anger has great understanding but he who is quick-tempered exalts folly" (14:29)

"He who is slow to anger is better than the mighty, and he who rules his spirit, than he who captures a city." (16:32)

"He who has a cool spirit is a man of understanding" (17:27)

"Like a city that is broken into and without walls is a man who has no control over his spirit" (25:28)

Proverbs speaks also to the education of the young, believing that "a child who gets his own way brings shame to his mother" (29:15) and urges us to "not hold back discipline from the child" (23:13), and sanctions corporal punishment to achieve this end. (Jesus himself, however, "never advocated such punishment."[12])

The New Testament is in general agreement with the Old Testament, and with the Greeks, on the imperative need for temperance or self-control, and the disastrous consequences of our failure to achieve this. Perhaps Paul's last words, the Second Epistle to Timothy, express this most forcefully:

"But realize this, that in the last days difficult times will come. For men will be lovers of self, lovers of money, boastful, arrogant, revilers, disobedient to parents, ungrateful, unholy, unloving, irreconcilable, malicious gossips, without self-control, brutal, haters of good, treacherous, reckless, conceited, lovers of pleasure rather than lovers of God..." (3:1-4). In those licentious times, Paul warns, education will be corrupted, "For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but wanting to have their ears tickled, they will accumulate for themselves teachers in accordance to their own desires (emphasis added); and will turn away their ears from the truth..." (4:3-4) Paul clearly recognizes that education may not always be the solution to our problems; oftentimes education becomes part of the problem itself.

The American colonists, fresh from the European Renaissance and Reformation, were heirs to the great traditions of the Greeks and Biblical Christianity. Additionally, however, they confronted a harsh frontier which exacerbated their culture's orientation. Their precarious existence dictated that they produce and store a surplus of food and other goods as insurance against drought, Indian raids and other contingencies. This could be best accomplished by emphasizing hard work and diligence on the one hand, and by frugally minimizing consumption on the other. Insofar as the frontier continued to play a significant role in American life, the twin notions of maximizing production and minimizing consumption prevailed as central moral guides. Soon it was recognized that even if food supplies and other necessities were not precarious, the Puritan ethic, or perhaps, more accurately, the frontier ethic, generated surplus capital which could be invested and reinvested in ever-better means of production.

A critical point arrived, perhaps about 100 years ago, when our rising productivity could easily meet all of our basic needs and many of our wants. Our theoretical choices at that point were three: (1) cease improving our productivity (the Luddite solution) and continue to work and consume at the prevailing levels, (2) continue to improve productivity (through technological innovations enabled by capital investment), to maintain our level of consumption and to work increasingly less; in other words, to convert our greater efficiency to greater leisure, or finally (3) to continue to push toward greater and greater productivity with high inputs of work, while simultaneously consuming at ever higher levels. This last option, of course, is the one we took, and our national character and popular culture, our domestic and foreign

policies and our educational efforts have been shaped by it.

The truth of this is so widely recognized that it is not necessary to supply excessive documentation. According to Business Week, the typical consumer is the recipient of 3,000 advertisements daily.[13] Though particular products are being merchandised, the general message is that all of our problems can be solved immediately by the consumption of the proper product.[14] A 1987 survey revealed that 93 percent of American teenage girls "deemed shopping their favorite pastime."[15] Other surveys have shown that in 1967 44 percent of college freshmen believed it was essential to be "very well off financially" and by 1990 that figure rose to 74 percent. In contrast, 83 percent believed it was essential to develop a meaningful philosophy of life in 1967, but by 1990 only 43 percent did.[16] Yet, despite our frenzied increase in production and consumption over the last 40 years or so, the National Opinion Research Center reports that Americans are no more happy today than they were in 1957.[17] As moralists, of course, we can bewail our materialism and profligacy and make comparisons with the fall of the Roman Empire, etc.

But it is more serious than this. It is not just that our souls are going to hell. Our world is being threatened so that the atmosphere and the oceans may never be the same again; species become extinct daily, and our children and our children's children for generations to come will suffer. Consider that "the world's people have consumed as many goods and services since 1950 as all previous generations put together. Since 1940, Americans alone have used up as large a share of the earth's mineral resources as did everyone before them combined."[18] The destruction of our environment and the depletion of our resources will continue at an explosive rate as the low-consuming 80 percent of the world strive to emulate the affluent 20 percent and as billions and billions of people are added to the world's population.

In government, education and elsewhere, there is a growing realization that something must be done, but so far it seems to be too little and too late. At the same time that we have an Environmental Protection Agency and an environmental Vice-President, we continue to measure our national health in terms of increasing the Gross Domestic Product, in continuing our frenetic levels of production and consumption.

In education we add courses and programs in environmental studies, while simultaneously believing that the central purpose of American education is to enhance productivity and beat the Japanese in the great economic battle. We need to reiterate the wisdom of St. Paul and recognize that our schools no longer "endure sound doctrine; but...accumulate themselves teachers (and programs and policies) in accordance (with our self-destructive) desires." Reform is indeed needed, but not to create greater economic efficiency. Reform is needed to create better minds, more responsible character and greater self-control. How can we do this?

VII. An Educational Reconstruction

First and foremost, educational philosophers need to lead concerned educators in a profound ongoing examination of every facet of the educational process to determine whether our policies and practices result in students who are more able or who are less able to postpone gratification. Here are some of the changes we might propose:

1. We need to devise strategies to decrease students' peer orientation and emphasize a parental or teacher orientation. Nothing allows the media to generate new wants and desires more than the present peer orientation of our people. Urie Bronfenbrenner's research reveals that "the adolescent peer group tends to emphasize immediate gratification and consumerism," and in addition, "heavy reliance on peers is one of the strongest predictors of problem behavior in adolescence and young adulthood."[19] Robert Coles finds it "very worrisome that almost 60 percent of the children in (his) survey rely on moral standards that have, as their main purpose, self-gratification."[20] Unfortunately, many of us have little faith in the success of parental orientation when too many of the parents themselves have become consumer oriented, and when more and more children are raised in one-parent or none-parent families. Our strategy, then, needs to make students more teacher-oriented. To do this it may be necessary for elementary students to remain with the same teacher for the whole 5- or 6-year span. Teachers would be more accountable for student outcomes and they might well become more caring parent surrogates. Likewise students may relate to each other more like siblings in a cooperative family and look increasingly for adult approval rather than for peer approval.

2. Teenagers need to have work de-emphasized. Presently too many of the 50% of high school students who work, work so excessively — as much as 50 hours weekly — that they have no time for homework and are tired and inattentive in school. Furthermore, the work is undertaken not to contribute to the family's income, but is used as disposal income to purchase and maintain cars and other articles of conspicuous consumption to gain status in their peer-oriented world of invidious comparisons.

Work which is well integrated into an educational process, of course, has a long and distinguished history in education. It is central to the polytechnical education advanced by Krupskaya and others and can be consistent with much of Dewey's emphasis on active learning. The distinction between work and labor should be made. Work conceived as a working-out of one's abilities is truly educative. Unfortunately, most of our teenagers are engaged in activities with few educational values for purely extrinsic rewards. They labor more than work.

3. There is some overt violence reported daily in the press of students robbing each other of their Reebok sneakers, gold chains, Oakland Raider jackets and other prestigious "in" material possessions. Others, of course, rob themselves of a good education by working to earn money to buy these things instead of gaining them illegally.

It seems obvious that we can diminish such violence in the schools as well as the teenage obsession with material possessions for status by one simple innovation: school uniforms. While few American public schools have ever required uniforms, they are the accepted norm in most schools around the world today and throughout history. Surveys have shown wide acceptance of the idea among parents and teachers alike.

One of the virtues of these proposals is that they cost nothing. Indeed, school uniforms would probably reduce parental expenditures on clothing. And if these

proposals do indeed lead to more self-control of students and a reversal of our consumeristic ethic our gains in school and society will be considerable. With change, as in so many things, success is in the details. We need to critically examine all of our educational practices, and if they contribute to our problems replace them with practices that contribute to solutions.

Endnotes

[1]William James, Principles of Psychology, vol I (New York: Henry Holt, 1890). p. 216.

[2]Schachtel, Ernst, Metamorphosis (NY: Basic Books, 1959).

[3]Thomas Hobbes, Leviathan (New York: Collier-Macmillan, 1962). Ch. 13-14.

[4]Aristotle, Politics, Bk. VIII, I.

[5]Tibor Scitovsky, The Joyless Economy (NY: Oxford, 1976).

[6]Max Weber, Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism. (N.Y.: Scribner's, 1958).

[7]Alan Witt, "Religion and Delay of Gratification" Psychological Reports, April 1988, vol. 62 (2) p. 426.

[8]Allison Davis, Social Class Influences upon Learning (The Inglis Lecture, 1948) (Cambridge: Harvard U., 1952) p. 32.

[9]Alfred Kinsey, Sexual Behavior in the Human Male (Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders, 1948).

[10]James S. Coleman *et. al* Equality of Educational Opportunity. (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966).

[11]Shoda, Yuichi; Mischel, Walter and Peake, Philip, "Predicting Adolescent Cognitive and Self-regulatory Competencies from Pre-school Delay of Gratification," Developmental Psychology, Nov. 1990, vol. 26(6) p. 978-986; Sinha, S. P. and Singh, Madhurima, "Some Personality Correlates of Cheating Behavior," Indian Journal of Current Psychological Research, April 1989, vol 4(1) p. 48-51; Funder, David and Block, Jack, "The Role of Ego-Control, Ego Resiliency and IQ in Delay of Gratification in Adolescence," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Dec. 1989, vol. 57(6) p. 1041-50; Rodriguez, Monica; Mischel, Walter, and Shoda, Yuichi, "Cognitive Person Variables in the Delay of Gratification of Older Children at Risk," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Aug. 1989, vol. 57(2) p. 358-367; Mischel, Walter; Shoda, Yuichi and Peake, Philip, "The Nature of Adolescent Competencies Predicted by Preschool Delay of Gratification," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, April 1988, vol. 54(4) p. 687-696.

[12]Philip Greven, Spare the Child (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1990) p. 51.

[13]Alan Thein Durning, How Much Is Enough?: The Consumer Society and the Future of the Earth (New York: W. W. Norton, 1992), p. 118.

[14]*ibid*, p. 114.

[15]*ibid*, p. 132.

[16]*ibid*, p. 34.

[17]*ibid*, p. 38-39.

[18]*ibid*, p. 38.

[19]Urie Bronfenbrenner, "Alienation and the Four Worlds of Childhood" Phi Delta Kappan, Feb. 1986, pp. 430-436.

[20]Robert Coles, "The moral Life of America's Schoolchildren" Teacher Magazine, vol. 1, 6, March 19, 1990.

PRAGMATIC CONCEPTIONS OF COMMUNITY

Sam Stack
West Virginia University

Forming a conception of community proves elusive at best. Community is a complex concept and ambiguous to the point of confusion, descriptive of social structure and normatively based. Community cannot be separated from human thought, action, purpose and values (Minar, 1969). This paper attempts to examine various conceptions of community through the work and influence of pragmatism. Certainly this creates limitations, but I hope at the minimum to establish a foundation for the meaning of community and its centrality in a democratic society. Although limited this paper briefly looks at the concepts of community in the work of Charles Sander Peirce, John Dewey, George Herbert Mead, C. Wright Mills and Jürgen Habermas. While Peirce and Dewey are normally associated with pragmatism, the thread of pragmatism runs throughout the work of Mead, Mills and Habermas. William James is not included in this discussion because of his limited discussion of society, although that is not to say he cannot make a contribution.

In contemporary discourse the concept of community tends to denote a specific entity or geographical location. We speak of the community store, the community ball park, the community center, the community church, the community of scholars and the community school. Community might be defined as a group of people who live in one place and who share the same government, background and interests.

John Dewey and Community

In Democracy and Education (1916) Dewey tells us we "live in a community in virtue of the things which we have in common" such as aims, beliefs, aspirations, knowledge and common understanding. There is a sharing of mutual interests here, a participation grounded in communication. Through communication that all members of the community become aware of common ends in a sense of shared interests. These interests regulate activity within the community (Dewey, 1916).

Classical social theory attempted to define community in trying to understand the transition from rural-agrarian society to industrial society. Perhaps such attempts are most clearly illustrated through the work of Emile Durkheim and Ferdinand Tönnies. Durkheim uses the descriptive labels of mechanical and organic solidarity to explain this transition. Mechanical solidarity describes the binding together of human groups by their similarities. Organic solidarity refers to the binding together of human groups based upon functional differences within the cooperative division of labor (Durkheim, 1984). Tönnies describes a community where there is a high degree of social cohesion based on value and normative consensus as a Gemeinshaft. The Gemeinshaft further exhibits a high degree of commitment to the community. He describes another type of society as Gesellshaft where social bonds are deliberately created on the basis of mutual interests and exchange. Tönnies viewed Gemeinshaft as the rural, peasant village, a cohesive social unit which he idealized for its supportive human relationships. Individual self-interests dominate the Gesellshaft with little consensus to norms and values. Individuals are more loosely connected and pursue their own interests rationally and efficiency (Tönnies, 1957).

Walter Lippmann in The Good Society (1937) warned against the power and wealth created by the new industrial order. Such would result in a natural increase in wealth, making nations more interdependent, destroying self-sufficiency and individuality. He challenged the idea of the "Great Society" being a "Good Society," calling for the utilization of moral standards to evaluate those institutions which we had created. George Counts (1934) during the same period offered a challenge to educators to prepare young people for active participation in a democratic society; a society which participates with other nations throughout the world in the exchange of goods, the advancement of knowledge and the quest for peace. Counts saw the world economy becoming more globally interdependent in terms of technology, transportation and communication. Counts' description has now become reality. His vision does not include those wishing to control, but those willing to participate within the global community of man. Perhaps this is where the moral dilemma lies.

Dewey shared this concern over the transformation of society from rural-agrarian to industrial, but attempts to resolve the dichotomy between Gemeinshaft and Gesellshaft, taking from both those qualities deemed necessary for democratic community. John Dewey's conception of community might be best articulated through The Public and Its Problems (1927). Here Dewey calls for a radicalization of democracy, a reconstruction of local communities and a revitalization of public life. The new age ushered in by technology and industrialization had created a public of impersonal association; the public in his words had become eclipsed and an eclipsed public will be an alienated public. Dewey states: "Till the Great Society is converted into a Great Community, the public will remain in eclipse. Communication alone creates a good community" (Dewey, 1916, p. 142). Dewey sought to cultivate debate, where people can discuss and persuade, however, the Great Community could never exist unless the public came face to face with the problems of communal life and attempt to solve them (Bernstein, 1986). To do this the public needed better methods for cultivating debate and discussion. Dewey speaks to the importance of free inquiry by experts who take into account the needs of the masses. The schools serves as a tool for the restoration of community life for it helps the masses gain the ability to judge knowledge in terms of its validity and common concerns. The school serves as a democratic public because it is a place where free inquiry can take place. In light of inquiry new let us look at C.S. Peirce.

C.S. Peirce and the Community of Inquirers

Charles Sanders Peirce speaks of the community of

inquirers, his conception strongly influencing both Dewey and Habermas. Peirce sought to turn philosophy "into one of those sciences where men can come to agreement" (Murphy, 1990, p. 12). For Peirce believes that the scientific method can help us speak clearly of knowledge, through and reality (Peirce, 1955). It is a method we can use to test opinions, placing opinion on probation until agreement is reached. Peirce wishes to use this method to fix belief in the community. He states: "Unless we make ourselves hermits, we shall necessarily influence each other's opinions; so that the problem becomes how to fix belief, not in the individual merely, but in the community" (Peirce, 1955, p. 13). For Peirce it is "necessary for a method to be found by which beliefs may be determined by nothing human, but by some external permanency (p. 18). Scientific methodology provides the method for Peirce.

Dewey believes people make bad choices when they lack information or cannot sort through the facts (Dewey, 1927). "Competition will continue," he states, "but it will be less rivalry for the acquisition of material goods, and more on emulation of local groups to enrich direct experience with appreciably enjoyed intellectual and artistic wealth" (p. 217). In discussing democracy in the context of community Dewey states: "Regarded as an idea democracy is not an alternative to other principles of associated life. It is the idea of community life itself" (Dewey, 1927, p. 148). Democracy is ethical association. For Dewey communal life constitutes the idea of democracy when fraternity, liberty, and equality isolated from communal life over hopeless abstraction. Yet when Dewey uttered these worked he believed the public to be inchoate and disorganized.

George Herbert Mead and Philos

The mutual influence of John Dewey on George Herbert Mead and vice versa is well known among scholars. Mead speaks of community in the sense of one of the Greek words for love, philos, or brotherhood. In this sense philos is expressed as identifying with the interests of all men. Once this brotherhood is formed, actions will them arise to meet the spiritual needs of man and the needs of society. Mead believed the institutional church had confined the idea of brotherhood to a cult value, although he did view religion as a means to bring men together. Mead further believed that a child's nature developed best in the social setting, "one of manageable size and complexity where growth and patterns of activity can be created and promoted and where a social consciousness can be reached beyond the setting. Mead like Dewey, held "the school could become a effective means of overcoming the loss of the sense of the community, if the school itself was a social unit" (Rucker, 1969, p. 93). Mead, like Dewey, viewed community as an ethical association where the individual achieved self-realization and developed personality. Within the community the individual finds freedom within the social order and is aware of the consequences of certain actions. Mead (1938) informs us

> we are all of us in some sense changing the social order in which we belong; our very being does it, and we ourselves change as we go on; there is always action to answer to reaction in the social world. That process of continuing reconstruction is the process of value and the only essential imperative I can see is that this essential social process has go to go one - the community, on the one hand and the values that make up the community. It has to continue not so much because the happiness of us all is worth more than the happiness of the individual, but being what we are, we have to continue being social beings, and society is essential to the individual just as the individual is essential to society (Mead, 1938, p. 45).

C. Wright Mills: Community via Communication

Sociologist C. Wright Mills wrote his dissertation on Peirce, James and Dewey , later published as Sociology and Pragmatism (1959). Mills' articulation of community can be found in The Power Elite (1959). Mills believed for a community to exist the following conditions had to be met.: an opportunity to give and hear opinions in a setting where the receiver of opinion has the opportunity to reply and possibly make that opinion public; an opportunity to implement the opinion via action and the freedom of the community to express itself free from external penetration (Mills, 1959; Tilman, 1984, p. 140). Community for Mills cannot be achieved when communication is blocked or distorted. Although critical of Dewey on certain accounts "both felt that the moral and political disciplines of local publics were essential, but possible only with greater citizen participation. While Mills may be more willing to challenge the power structure in terms of radical active inquiry both he and Dewey feel the community can exist only if social inequalities are abolished. Both Mills and Dewey believed the values of the community should be secular, scientific and altruistic, but these are based on the public having the intelligence and egalitarian values to cut through complex issues of human social existence. Mills did not believe a democracy could exist if the public proved incapable or was prevented in debating openly and clearly. He called for a medium of genuine conversation where private troubles can become public issues free from external constraint (Mills, 1959; Tilman, 1984).

Habermas and the Public Sphere

Jürgen Habermas' discussion of the public sphere can further help clarify the concept of community. From his early writings he has been concerned with the dissolution of the public sphere found on the principle of discursive will formation (better stated as constraint free discussion). The public sphere is one where people confer with each other in unrestricted fashion serving to guarantee freedom of assembly and the freedom to express public opinion based upon general interests (Held, 1980). This type of debate is governed by critical reason and not on absolutes or dogmas. Habermas seems to view the public sphere as a mediator between civil society and the state (Habermas, 1989). He believes the public sphere began to from around the time of the French Revolution, synonymously with the development of a market economy. As the market economy grows the civil society and the state become less distinct and absorbs the public sphere. Habermas uses the public sphere today in social democracies as competition between organizations with conflicting interests. These organisms debate and compromise among themselves

and do not involve the public. While public opinion might be taken into account it is not in the form of public debate and discussion. The media has become the chief tool for public information creating a technology of moral consensus (Held, 1980; Kellner, Habermas, 1989). For Habermas, critically debated public opinion has collapsed into the personal opinions of private individuals and private interests. Opinions can be used for show and manipulation. Debate through the form of critical discussion and caring to some form of reasoned agreement from the basis of what most of us perceive as democratic theory. Habermas essentially tells us when communication is distorted or controlled, no community means no democracy.

Through this brief discussion of Peirce, Mead ,Dewey, Mills and Habermas we can clearly see the emphasis on free and undistorted communication among the community of inquirers. Ideally this is done in an atmosphere of mutual interest and concern for the other; again a ethical association. This ethical association does not imply a "do your own thing, go for the gusto, or "just do it" attitude. Perhaps these simplistic media slogans speak to our unlimited and distorted view of individualism. These limits prove so broad that it results in the ignoring of the "interest of other in the faith that the invisible hand of the market place would allocate values, reward virtue and punish vices" (Minar, 1969, p. X). A society perpetuating an individualism resulting in individual actions regardless of consequences is undermining community, thus destroying democracy.

Douglas Kellner in his book Television and the Crisis of Democracy (1990) speaks to the power of the media to distort and control communication. Kellner develops the thesis that the great communicator today, the television, is largely controlled by capitalists interests. Kellner believes the greatest threat to democracy is capitalism because it has the potential to distort communication and benefit from distorted communication. Yet, on a positive not he does see possibilities for the media to serve in the interest of the critically debating public sphere Public control of television stations and computer mail could serve as sources of dialogue, but they must be separated from capitalist interest.

In Individualism Old and New (1930) Dewey states that the nature of capitalism with its focus on individualist profit undermined people working together for the common good. He tells us when people pursue their own gain they care little for participatory association as for the welfare of others, thus the participatory nature of democracy as ethical association becomes non-existent. This type of individualism will eventually result in a loss of identity for what we are depends upon social interaction (Bellah, 1991; Westbrook, 1991).

Educators have become distracted by the political rhetoric so influential in stimulating educational reform policy in the 1980's and now 1990's. Our idealized enemy of the Soviet Union has been replaced by the economic advances of Japan and Germany. America 2000, now Goals 2000 is couched in economic concern. Robert Bellah (1991) in The Good Society believes we have been reduced into a fantasy, concerning ourselves with the short term solution, the quick fix, seeking immediate pleasure rather than considering the effect of an action in the long run. In Dewey's fashion Bellah states: "Greed and paranoia, and their giant institutional form are enemies of no settlement and cultivation (p. 275). In other words they disrupt the community. Bellah (1991) states: "The idea of an education that simply gives individuals the skills they need to be a success or get ahead in this world is not enough. Normally this is conceived as job preparation in a technical economy. What we need is the true pragmatic sense of a community of morally and sensitive people where are capable of acting responsibility" (Bellah, 1991, p. 170).

Our number one goal in education should help foster a sense of the common good characterized by public spirit and ethical association, yet as educators we know well that all institutions must be transformed democratically to make the genuine education society, the good society. We must extend our notion of community beyond outside national boundaries in the reconstructionist sense which will hopefully result in moral deliberation regarding economic exploitation, environmental exploitation and cultural ethnocentrism. C.A. Bowers (1993) calls for the concept of community to be extended even further. Bowers wishes to include the biotic community, forming what he calls an ecological ethic. Freedom in the sense of individualism does not give us the right to exploit nature without a regard for the consequences. Citing Aldo Leopold (1970) Bowers uses a pyramid metaphor in an attempt to explain how interdependent humanity is on the biotic community. This still must be viewed as an ethical association. We must emphasize moral discourse in the classroom, seeking to communicate, contemplate, inquire and persuade in the true democratic sense of self-expression.

Richard Rorty in Consequences of Pragmatism (1982) speaks to the role self- realization in community:

> Our identification with our community, our society, our political tradition, or intellectual heritage is heightened when we see this community as ours rather than natures, shaped rather than formed, one among many which men have made. In the end the pragmatists tell us , what matters is our loyalty to other human beings clinging together against the dark, not our hope of getting things right (Rorty, 1982, p. 165-166).

SOURCES

Bellah, R. (1991). The good society. New York: Vintage Press.

Bernstein, R. (1986). Philosophical profiles. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Bowers, C.A. (1993). Critical essays on education, modernity and the recovery of the ecological imperative. New York: Teachers College.

Dewey, J. (1916). Democracy and education. New York: Macmillan.

Dewey, J. (1927). The public and its problems. New York: Henry Holt and Company.

Dewey, J. (1930). Individualism old and new. In The Later Works, 1925-1953. Carbondale: Southern Illinois Press.

Durkheim, E. (1984). The division of labor in society. New York: Free Press.

Habermas, J. (1989). The structural transformation of the public sphere. translated by T. Burger. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Held, D. (1980). Introduction to critical theory: Horkeimer to Habermas. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Kellner, D. (1989). Critical theory, Marxism, and modernity. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.

Leopold, A. (1970). A Sandy county almanac. San Francisco: Ballentine.

Lippman, W. (1937). The good society. Boston: Little and Brown.

Mead, G.H. (1938). The philosophy of the act. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mills, C.W. (1959). The power elite. New York: Oxford University Press.

Mills, C.W. (1966). Sociology and pragmatism. New York: Oxford University Press.

Minar, D.W. (1969). The concept of community (readings with interpretations). Chicago: Northerwestern University Press.

Murphy, J.P. (1990). Pragmatism: from Peirce to Davidson. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.

Peirce, C.S. (1955). Philosophical writings. edited by Justus Buchler. New York: Dover Publications.

Rorty, R. (1982). Consequences of pragmatism. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Rucker, D. (1969). The Chicago pragmatists. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Tilman, R. (1984). C. Wright Mills: a native radical and his American intellectual roots. University Park: Pennsylvania State University.

Tönnies, F. (1957). Community and society. translated by C.P. Lewis. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University.

Westbrook, R. (1991). John Dewey and American democracy. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

INTERNATIONAL PARTNERSHIPS IN EDUCATION

Margaret Clark and Annette Digby
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

> Teachers must break away from the "them" and "us" orientation which separates study of "American society" and the study of "other" societies and find better ways of equipping students with the intellectual tools they must have to deal with the realities of an increasingly interdependent world society. (Bergen, & Kelley, 1985)

During the past decade demographic, ecological, sociological, economic, and physical changes in world structures have transformed nations and peoples in such a way that disparate systems have, out of necessity, become interdependent. In response to such changes, educational partnerships have evolved as one means by which two or more educational institutions devise and implement plans of action for furthering interdependence. The implications of educational interdependence have led to the development of international connections that (1) promote greater understanding and appreciation of other peoples and (2) address problems inherent in a newly developing interdependent economic order.

As we progress toward the 21st century and as barriers between countries are removed, international education becomes increasingly important. As Bergen and Kelley (1985) expressed, our educational system must provide teachers with training, education, and tools that will enable them to prepare students for functioning in a global society. Many initiatives in international education are based upon the following stipulated definition that international education examines:

> 1. the informal, nonformal, and formal educational relationships among peoples of various nation-states;
> 2. those issues that are global in nature and transcend national boundaries;
> 3. the emergent trends that are creating greater interdependency and interrelationships among people as members of global society (Gutek, 1993).

The University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, specifically the College of Education, has been endeavoring to expand its international perspectives. In preparation for expansion, it has been necessary to review existing models and practices of other universities, both here and abroad. The purposes of this paper, therefore, are (1) to review successful domestic partnerships, (2) to review successful international partnerships, and (3) to discuss present and future international initiatives specifically involving the University of Arkansas.

Domestic Partnerships: Prelude to International Partnerships

As we head toward the twenty-first century, problems facing educational systems are complex and varied. No one institution can, or should, act independently to address those problems. The interdependence that universities and public school systems have upon each other as they prepare pre-service educators to face the challenges of a new century is summarized as follows:

> Public schools have an unmet need for better teachers. In order to produce these better teachers, universities need access to exemplary school settings in which to place their student teachers and to conduct research on effective practices. This research in turn can be used by the schools to improve the educational experiences provided to elementary and secondary students. These well-prepared elementary and secondary students will eventually meet the universities unmet need for excellent undergraduate and graduate students. And so on. (Theobald, 1990, p.2)

Recognizing the need for collaboration,the Holmes Group (*Tomorrow's Schools*, 1990) proactively established guidelines for the establishment of educational partnerships. Specifically, public school and university colleagues should work together to solve the problems of education.

Rationale for Domestic Partnerships

Goodlad (1990), summarizing the results of his five-year Study of the Education of Educators, listed 19 postulates that the considered essential for quality teacher education programs. A review of the postulates reveals several statements calling for school/university collaboration to be an integral component of the teacher education process. Specifically, the fifteenth postulate called for teacher educators to utilize the public schools as exemplary laboratory settings for observations and for hands-on experiences; the sixteenth postulate presented the need for future teachers to engage in discussions about the conflicts and incongruities that often exist between theory and practice.

The College of Education at the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, initiated partner school relationships January 1990 with two elementary schools, two middle schools, and one high school in three public school districts in Northwest Arkansas. This modest, small-scale beginning provided all members of the various partnerships an opportunity to gain ownership in the collaborative process and to begin communicating in a relatively non-threatening manner. Establishing partner school relationships, both national and international, is a process that requires commitment and communication. Realizing that "small successes" frequently serve as foundations for "larger successes," the University of Arkansas began its partnership initiative with local school districts. A review of these successful domestic partnerships reveals several principles that should be applied when establishing international relationships. Also included is a section on successful domestic partnerships within the United States other than those involving the University of Arkansas and those that are within other

countries.

Initial Steps

Successful partnerships do not "just happen." Some concerns/issues that must addressed include identification of partner sites, identification of interested faculty, and identification of mutual goals.

Identification of Partners with Shared Vision/Philosophy. Criteria for selection of partnership sites may include demographics that represent a variety of student socioeconomic levels, school sizes/locations/grade levels, and faculty compositions. Faculty interest at each partnership site should also be a high priority. A partnership will experience maximum success only if teachers and faculty at involved institutions are dedicated to the success of the partnership and are willing to work together to reach mutual goals. De Bevoise (1986) pointed out that "when suggesting personnel for a cooperative project, administrators want to look not only for people who have good ideas but who are also good listeners, capable of hearing the opposite point of view" (p.11).

Identification of a core group of faculty with an expressed interest in developing school/university/business partnerships. The "ideal" team size will vary based upon total number of faculty and interest. A suggested range for the total number of steering committee members, representing all constituents, is from ten to twenty.

Identification of mutual needs, interests, and goals. Partnership arrangements should be mutually beneficial for all participants. Only if the two partners are compatible can this goal be achieved. The partnership arrangements should be mutually beneficial for all participants.

Initial Meetings

For the partnerships to have a successful beginning, participants should have no pre-set or hidden agenda. The agendas, both short-term and long-term, should be mutual agreed upon by all participants. The following suggestions are offered as means of facilitating the development and implementation of a partnership agenda:

Initial meetings should be open-ended. A flexible agenda provides an opportunity for all participants to provide input into the direction of the partnership. De Bevoise (1986) concurred, "Ultimately, the collaborators need to recognize not only their own interests but also the needs and perspectives of all represented in the collaborative venture" (p. 10). After participants compile a proposed list of mutually acceptable partnership activities/projects, successive partnership meetings should focus on the prioritized selection and implementation of projects that support the nature, structure, and purpose of each partnership arrangement.

Appoint a site coordinator for each partner institutions. Coordinators function only as communication links; they have no more "power" in the partnership team than any other member. Specifically, to promote the feelings of ownership among all participants, activities and duties should be distributed equally. In any partnership, commitment, mutual respect, and freedom of communication contribute to successful completion of goals.

Partnership Activities

As noted earlier, each partnership team should develop and implement activities/projects that will meet their needs and will be mutually beneficial for all involved. Ideally, when deciding upon activities, emphasis is placed is upon the needs of both students and faculty at each site. Since the formation of domestic partnerships, the University of Arkansas faculty and public school faculty have engaged in a variety of successful activities that can be categorized as professional development activities, collaborative instructional activities, and collaborative research projects.

Professional Development Activities. One large-scale partnership activity at the University of Arkansas is the provision of professional development opportunities. In response to the requests for professional development activities, university faculty have conducted workshops on a variety of topics, including

*classroom management techniques,
*cooperative learning in the secondary school setting,
*middle-level education,
*issues related to special needs students,
*student teacher supervision,
*whole language, and
*goal-setting.

The workshops are planned by the partnership teams based upon the needs of the participants and the expertise of the university faculty. University partners also assist public school personnel in locating other speakers, facilitators, and consultants. In addition, university faculty assist in the writing of grants and in locating sources of funding for educational programs.

Collaborative Instructional Activities. University and public school faculties have engaged in a wide range of activities that enhance instruction at all levels, with high levels of success achieved in each of the following areas: The University of Arkansas and its public school partners have experienced success in the following areas:

**Faculty Exchanges/Guest Speakers*. Faculty exchanges allow university and public school faculty to break down the barriers that often exist between the two institutions. Public school faculty who serve as guest lecturers in university classrooms may enhance the credibility of the material while discussing their own classroom experiences. Likewise, university personnel who return to a public school classroom become active participants in day-to-day teaching activities while becoming aware of current trends and issues faced by public school personnel. Successful activities include university personnel serving as guest speakers on topics such as computerized IEPs and resource room materials and public school team members speaking to university classes on the characteristics of the middle level student and the composition of resource file for special needs students.

**Panels*. Representatives from each institution work together to disseminate information to parents and community leaders. For example, one panel presented information to parent/teacher organizations on the use of cooperative learning strategies with middle level students and professionalization of teaching.

**Committee Service*. Committee service by participants from both the public school partners and the university partners is a key component. At least one

public school representative serves on each search committee at the university. The development and implementation of new programs, including the Master of Arts in Teaching and the Doctor of Philosophy in Curriculum and Instruction, have necessitated the establishment of numerous task forces, each with public school representatives. Similarly, university faculty serve on committees established by the public schools, including a building and planning committee at one of the local junior high schools. Because of the partnership agreements, university faculty do not expect compensation for time required to provide professional development opportunities for public school faculty. The reward is that the public school partners present their school as a research laboratory for use by the university team.

**Tutorial Programs*. The university and public school partners have established an effective tutorial program for students with limited English proficiency. The program has allowed many students to experience academic success as a direct result of program sponsored solely as part of a partnership arrangement.

**On-site Education Courses*. During the Spring 1993 semester, three Curriculum and Instruction courses were taught on public school campuses. Collaboration between university and public school representatives resulted in the ability to take the courses off campus and to meet in a laboratory setting.

Collaborative Research Projects. Because of the partnership agreements, university faculty do not expect compensation for time required to provide professional development opportunities and other services described in the previous paragraphs. The reward is that the public school partners present their school as a research laboratory for use by the university team. As a result, research projects focusing on the following issues have either been completed or are currently underway:

*relationship between teacher planning and instructional outcomes,
*attitudes of middle level students toward cooperative learning, and
*reality vs. best practice in the use of cooperative learning with middle-level students.

As a result, public school faculty have opportunities to engage in action research that they otherwise might not have the time or expertise to complete. Likewise, university personnel maintain contact with true concerns and issues faced by public school teachers and students. "Collaboration with university personnel appears to result in greater control of the validity and reliability of research projects, as well as help to disseminate the findings to a wider audience" (Kern, Digby, & McDavis, 1991, 17).

Recent Outcomes of Domestic Collaboration

The activities described above have been integral components of partnership arrangements since 1990. Recently, additional programs/activities have led to the expansion of domestic partnerships. One result of collaboration is the submission of a grant requesting substantial funding for the enhancement and expansion of partnership activities in the Northwest Arkansas region.

Another recent outcome is the *Partners in Education* program. Through the efforts of the College of Education Development Office, businesses have joined with the University and local schools to provide partial funding for projects such as the (1) African-Americans: Future Educators of Arkansas Conference, (2) Center for Middle Level Education, Research, and Development housed on the University of Arkansas campus, and (3)George Elementary School Partnership, an example of a highly successful public school/partnership arrangement.

Expanding the partnership concept, the College of Education became a member of the Arkansas Education Renewal Consortium, an outgrowth of the state's response to John Goodlad's proposals, a group which includes seven universities and fifteen school districts, with a goal of restructuring education in public schools. Most of the activities address problems and concerns that the members have. These activities have included middle school mathematics , whole language, and grantwriting workshops.

Under the leadership of the Vocational Education Department, members of different departments in the College, representatives from the Division of Continuing Education, faculty from Arkansas Technical College, and representatives from the management team of the Tyson poultry industry had set up a Cultural Diversity Task Force. The charge of the task force was to develop and implement a project designed to educate and sensitize leaders, managers, and supervisors to the realities of cultural diversity in the workforce. In the first phase of its work, the Task Force developed an assessment instrument for determining the impact of linguistic and cultural differences between the managerial and supervisory personnel of a diverse workforce on productivity. This example of cooperation between the University of Arkansas and the corporate sector represents internationally expanding business, specifically in this case the internationally expanding Tyson Corporation.

In addition, a partnership with the Walton Arts Center in Fayetteville, Arkansas, allows teacher educator to receive graduate credit for participation in workshops and institutes sponsored by the Center.

Overview of Selected Successful Educational Partnerships in Other Countries

On the global scene, there are several universities in other countries that are embracing the partnership model for the improvement of the institution of education by including the corporate sector in their relationships with public schools. Three examples of these are included in the descriptions of partnerships in OECD (Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development) Member Countries in *School and Business: A New Partnership* (1992).

In France, Ariane, a teacher retraining program in Grenoble, includes as partners the Grenoble Office of Ministry of Education, vocational high schools, local businesses, and the University of Grenoble. The program adapts, converts, and places mid-career teachers of technical subjects with out-dated skills into new jobs. It started in 1988-89 with 80 teachers and by 1990-91, there were 230 teachers. Typical of the conversions were the teachers of mechanics who retrained to become teachers of mathematics and who include the needs of the businesses in their curriculum and instruction programs (*Schools and Business: A New Partnership*,

1992).

In Canada, the Ottawa-Carleton Learning Foundation had a partnership composed of five school boards, two universities, 2 community colleges, and business and labor representatives. Started in 1985, the program focused on the improvement of the educational system in Ottawa-Carleton by helping schools promote science, engineering, and technology. This illustrates a regional coalition to coordinate a system-wide change (*Schools and Business: A New Partnership*, 1992).

Another successful example of the partnership movement in Canada is the Learning Consortium that was started in February 1988 in the Toronto area (Clark, 1991). The consortium included four school districts and two higher educational institutions. The teachers, administrators, and professors involved are producing new research findings in "their living laboratory" environment, thereby linking classroom improvement, teacher development, and school improvement within the same framework (Pullan, 1990).

Project Lindholmen, plans for a "society of knowledge" in Gothenburg, Sweden, had a partnership team composed of the City of Gothenburg, the Board of Education, the County Labour, Board, the Regional Employment Training Board, the University of Gothenburg, Chalmers Technical University, and companies representing trade, industry, and technology. Their objectives included 1. the creation of modern workforce training and renewal in basic education suited to young people, to employees and to accelerating change in society; and 2. the means of enabling partners to make joint use of premises and equipment, administration, information, marketing, personnel, development, and on-going training (*Schools and Business: A New Partnership*, 1992).

International Initiatives

Recent changes in national and international boundaries have created additional opportunities for collaboration between countries. As a result, educational collaboration which includes educational institutions, the corporate sector, and the community at large is also occurring among countries around the world. The American Council on Education (1984) published the "Guidelines for College and University Linkages Abroad" that defined direct operational ties as those arrived at through mutual agreement, that provide joint benefit and that require shared investment of financial and human capital. These guidelines are serving to underscore the expansion of the College contacts.

Rationale for International Partnerships

International understanding can play a vital role in solving global problems such as health, poverty, nutrition, hunger, illiteracy, pollution, and substance abuse; that understanding may also help prevent major confrontations and conflicts between and among countries. The College, concerned about the preparation of teachers for such international and intercultural understanding, is involved in plans that will enhance and enlarge our international emphases. In light of the 1978 study "International Linkages in Higher Education: A Feasibility Study" which concluded that direct links, generally at the departmental level, are the best avenues of American participation in emerging global education systems, some of the faculty members in the College of Education are hoping to expand the contacts they have made with Bolivians as an outcome of two different but related programs.

Models of International Partnerships between Countries

Not only have in-country efforts been relatively successful, but there are signs that the numbers of partnerships are increasing. However, the direction in which the University of Arkansas is heading is the establishment of global partnership linkages whereby the University joins with other universities/colleges and public and private elementary and secondary schools in other countries for mutual benefits. These linkages may be expanded to include businesses and industries.

Four models were reviewed for consideration. The primary model for this effort are the highly successful linkages projects that have been implemented through the Partners of the Americas with pairings of universities in the United States and universities in Brazil. The Partners of the Americas is a non-profit organization that links citizens of 45 U. S. states with those of 32 Latin American and Caribbean countries through 61 partnerships. Partnerships are community-based and composed of volunteers who work with their counterparts in their partner country.

In less than five years, there were 35 institutional linkages between the United States and Brazil. They are involved in international education, research, and education about other people, languages, and cultures. The projects have addressed problems of a wide variety ranging from the control of disease in fish and shellfish between the Federal Rural University of Rio de Janeiro and the University of Maryland; mining techniques between the Federal University of Ouro Preto and the Colorado School of Mines; agribusiness and engineering between the Federal University of Uberlandia and Colorado State University; collaborative research in tropical medicine and disease between the Federal University of Bahia and the Medical College of Pennsylvania; a program of marine biology between the University of Ceara and the University of New Hampshire; a dental education program between the Federal University of Piaui and the University of Nebraska; development of critically-needed water resources in the parched hinterland of Paraiba between the Federal University of Paraiba and the University of Connecticut; exchanges in orthopedics and traumatic injuries between the Faculty of Medical Sciences of Santa Casa in Sao Paulo and the University of Illinois at Chicago, and the University of Tennessee- Knoxville has one of the largest Portuguese enrollments in the country (Hayden, 1989).

Also in the medical sciences field, another model of a successful partnership exists between the University of Northern Colorado and the University Autonomous of Benito Juarez of Oaxaca, Mexico. The purpose of the partnership was to develop a baccalaureate program for the education of nurses and to deliver health care to rural Oaxaca. In listing the results of the program, Arlton and Miller (1987)reported that one of the most gratifying outcomes has been the establishment of strong professional and personal ties with colleagues of different cultures (Clark, 1991).

A third partnership model is the example of a cross-cultural emphasis is the Boston University Professional International Linkage Program in Niger (West Africa), which was developed in 1985 by the Boston University School of Education and the University of Niamey. One major purpose of the innovation teacher exchange program is to promote faculty exchange and collaboration in the areas of teaching and research (Brewer and Boatman, 1991).

Finally, the fourth successful model whereby a university is internationalized is the transactive model of exchange that the College of Health and Human Services at San Diego State University instituted to provide two-way exchanges of information and service with the Republic of China. During a two-year span a total of thirty-five short-term visits have been made by San Diego State faculty and administrators to the Republic of China, and fifteen representatives from the Republic of China (including several Taiwan university presidents) have visited the campus of San Diego State University in pursuit of a series of projects ranging from Sino-American conferences to the provision of workshops and the conduction of research (Dual and Cheng, 1991).

Prelude to Expansions of Global Activities

A major goal of the College of Education at the University of Arkansas is to expand international partnerships. One of the major initiatives is based upon the College's Overseas Program in Bolivia. One faculty member is sent to stay two weeks in three Bolivian cities, Cochabamba, La Paz, and Santa Cruz. At each site, the faculty member teaches a selected graduate course in the American sponsored school located within that city. The teacher participants in the courses, some of whom are Bolivians, often come to the University of Arkansas in order to complete a master degree program.

Additionally, students have been able to go to Bolivia for part of their field experience, the student teaching experience, and reside with members of the faculty/staff at the American sponsored school or with members of the community. These experiences greatly enhance their awareness of cultural differences. In one instance, a young man who was majoring in Spanish was immersed in a Hispanic culture while he was teaching Spanish primarily to American students at the American sponsored school. During the Spring 1993 semester, a young African-American student majoring in elementary education went to in Bolivia for part of her field experience. Inasmuch as the projected demographics for America 2000 depict an America with an Hispanic population destined to be the number one minority group, most future teachers can expect to encounter pupils from such ethnic backgrounds. Thus, this experience for this young African-American woman is viewed as favorable preparation for teaching in the American multicultural society.

Secondly, a few faculty members in the College are involved with the Arkansas/East Bolivia Partners of the Americas. A recent needs assessment project revealed the need to strengthen educational partnership activities and to establish educational linkages between the College and the public schools in East Bolivia. In an effort to capitalize on the College's Bolivian program, efforts are underway to increase the utilization of the faculty members that are sent down to Bolivia by having them offer workshops, seminars, or short courses, in the public schools and by serving as consultants to public school teachers and/or administrators.

Proposed Implementation of Global Partnerships

The efforts of a University of Arkansas faculty member who had visited under the auspices of the Bolivian Overseas Program led to the development of the Bolivian Enrichment Partnership composed of representatives from the University of Arkansas at Fayetteville, USA; the Cochabamba Cooperative School; the Universidad Privado Boliviano (UPB); and the Minister of Education for Bolivia through its Servico de Appoyo Educativo Departmenta (SAED). A primary goal of the partnership has been to conduct summer institutes in mathematics and science education; during the past two years, there have been over 160 teachers and administrators from both public and private school that have participated in summer institutes.

The partnership was established to provide Bolivian teachers with new ideas in learning, especially in mathematics. As a result of these collaborative efforts, a project has been proposed that would (1) establish a post-graduate master's degree program at the new Bolivian private university (UPB); (2) allow participants in the Bolivian Enrichment Partnership to receive university credit toward their master's degree at the UPB; (3) establish an Instructional Enrichment Institute, which would be conducted primarily by University of Arkansas faculty on the campus of the Cochabamba Cooperative School, and would focus on curriculum theories and methodologies; (4) establish the UPB Shadow Program to promote a closer relationship between the University of Arkansas and UPB in order for the faculty at UPB to learn the latest methods in administration; these faculty members from the UPB would "shadow" faculty members at the University of Arkansas; and (5) establish the Continuing Education Center, a complete instructional resource facility, that will offer the facilities and resources to partnership members for improving the quality of instruction.

Additionally, a plan for establishing an Intercultural/International Educational Studies Center within the College of Education has been submitted. One component of the center would include the establishment of a linkage between the Universidad Privada de Santa Cruz, the private university in Santa Cruz, and the College of Education at the University of Arkansas. Under this umbrella, the director of the center would facilitate the arrangements for faculty and student exchanges between American and Bolivian colleges/universities and public or private school personnel; collaboration on research programs and projects; exchange of innovative instructional techniques; and the planning and scheduling of workshops, seminars, and short-term courses designed to address mutual needs and interests.

A third initiative involves the proposal of a partnership between two of the universities in the University of Arkansas system (University of Arkansas, Fayetteville and University of Arkansas, Pine Bluff) and the Universidad Privada de Santa Cruz. Active participants will be their Colleges of Education and Colleges of Agriculture. This program, if approved, will not only aid the improvement of agricultural practices but also endeavor to assist with the education and training of those

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

involved in the production of food.

Other proposed plans for increased international involvement include the use of technology. For improved communication purposes, the plans involve the utilization of distance learning and the establishment of an Internet "hub" within partnership sites, such as Bolivia. Through electronic mail and bulletin boards, partnership participants will be able to receive consultant help, to preview sample materials, to identify relevant resources, and to work collaboratively on projects such as locating funding sources, locating classroom space, and securing guest speakers.

Summary

The sample models included in this paper attest to the wide variety of model types that is continually expanding. They run the gamut from rural adult education, to health education, to teacher education, to medical education, and to cross-cultural training.

These models can be viewed as successful because they (1) reflect systemic, rather than local concerns; (2) are flexible; (3) are based on mutual agreement, (4) have mutually beneficial interests, (5) are operated jointly, (6) thrive on open communication, and (7) are open to innovation. It is evident that if educational institutions of higher learning are to meet the needs and challenges inherent in the preparation of teachers to preserve life and overcome poverty, they will initiate or expand their involvement in the international partnership movement.

REFERENCES

Arlton, D., & Miller, M. (1987). An international partnership in health care and education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 303 123).

Bergen, T. J., Jr., & Kelley, L. M. (1985). International education: Toward the future. *International Education, 15* (1), 5-8.

Brewer, E., & Boatman, K. (1991). The Boston University Professional International Linkage Program in Niger: An exchange model for education students and faculty. *Phi Beta Delta International Review, 2*, 77-92.

Centre for Educational Research and Innovation (CERI). (1992). *Schools and business: A new partnership.* Paris: OECD (Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development).

Clark, M. (1991). One or one plus one? In J. J. Van Patten (Ed.). *Human Energy Shaping the Future: Proceedings of the Southern Futures Society 14th Annual Meeting* (pp. 59-68).

De Bevoise, W. (1986). Collaboration: Some principles of bridgework. *Educational Leadership, 43*(5): 9-12.

Dual, P. L, & Cheng, L. L. (1991). Internationalizing the university: A transactive model of exchange, predicated on education, participation, and training. *Phi Beta Delta International Review, 2*, 77-92.

Fullan, M. G., et al. (1990, May). Linking classroom and school improvement. *Educational Leadership*, pp. 13-15.

Goodlad, J. (1990). Better teachers for our nation's schools. *Phi Delta Kappan, 72*(3): 185-194.

Guidelines for College and University Linkages Abroad. (1984). Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Gutek, G. L. (1993). *American education in a global society: Internationalizing teacher education.* NY: Longman.

Hayden, R. L. (1989). *Lasting Links: U.S. -Brazil University Partnerships.* Washington, D.C.: Partners of the Americas.

The Holmes Group. (1990). *Tomorrow's schools: Principles for the design of professional development schools.* East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group, Inc.

International Linkages in Higher Education: A Feasibility Study. (1978). Submitted to AID in February, 1978, by a consortium of education associations. Contact NASULGC, One Dupont Circle Washington, D.C. 20036 for further information and availability.

Kern, S. J., Digby, A. D., & McDavis, R. J. (1991). A professional development school: Getting started. *GATEways to Teacher Education, 4* (1): 13-18.

Theobald, N. (1990). *The Financing and Governance of Professional Development or Partner Schools* (Occasional Paper No. 10). Seattle, Washington: Center for Educational Renewal.

A Study of the Degree of Progressivism Among Arkansas Public School Superintendents: Implications for Educational Reform

Ann E. Witcher
University of Central Arkansas

Attempts at 1990s educational reform are focusing upon immense structural changes for the American public school with at least three major areas consistently being addressed: (a) changes in teaching and learning, (b) changes in teacher working conditions, and (c) changes in the governance and organization of the schools.[1] In light of today's mounting pressure for change, those responsible for school operations are faced not only with developing but also with implementing educational policies promoting basic, and perhaps massive, institutional change.

Because the school superintendent often exerts the greatest influence upon local educational change, his or her recommendations may well determine the amount, type, and speed of a district's restructuring initiatives. As part of this recommendation process, Van Cleve Morris stated that "an administrator must argue for what he thinks the community ought to want, educate them to the point of really wanting it, and then supply it to them."[2] Herein lies the core of the reform attempts: The administrator's beliefs about what the community ought to want.

With regard to the nature of the learner, the demands of the culture, and the subject matter considered most worth learning, Roger C. Doll noted that two major belief systems have emerged and present themselves in contemporary American public schools: the transmissive and the progressive viewpoints.[3] These two belief systems are in opposition to one another regarding educational practices, aims of education, authority versus freedom, and the uses of subject matter. Doll clarified the positions: "Traditionalists" espouse "what has been done in the past has been done well; therefore, we should hold on to it in the future," but noted that the "Progressives" implore us to "look critically at past actions and practices to see what now can be done differently to make learning more satisfying and effective."[4]

Morris summarized the transmissive and progressive viewpoints.[5] According to him, those of the conservative stance believe that any change in education should be based upon the results of experimental changes in other schools and school systems. Because they believe that the needs of the community and students remain relatively constant, they are more likely to be reluctant to revise, modify, or redesign schools. In contrast, those with a progressive viewpoint generally are eager to match school programming to contemporary needs in order to make education meaningful and relevant to the interests and abilities of students. At times, the curriculum and programming of the school seem to be undergoing continuous change and revision. These two viewpoints, transmissive and progressive, can be looked upon as exemplifying two formal systems of educational thought: Essentialism and Progressivism.

Essentialism, a traditional view of education, is one that regards the school as an academic institution and curator of established knowledge. Essentialists are oriented to the cognitive aspects of education which are skill and outcome based. The basic purpose of schooling is to prepare the young for later life using a teacher-centered, curriculum-focused approach. A primary goal of Essentialist education is to impart the content of the time-tested curriculum in order to promote and maintain national standards. As a result, Essentialists may appear unwilling to initiate reform endeavors. Persons of this belief system may exhibit attitudes of reluctance and caution toward change.

Progressivism is a more method-oriented view of education. The school is viewed not only as a social institution, but also as an integral part of the student's present, on-going life. The basic purpose of schooling is to help students acquire the skills needed to live within an ever-changing world. In contrast to Essentialism, Progressivism is teacher-student centered, participatory, and emphasizes cooperative inquiry. Although the academic curriculum is important, it is regarded as a means to education rather than an end. Those of the Progressive school of thought favor a living/learning process and may appear to adopt quick-fix solutions as they eagerly approach innovation and change within the educational arena.

With the implementation of Arkansas Act 236 of 1991, state superintendents are mandated to engage in the restructuring of Arkansas public schools.[6] To succeed in meeting the intent of this law requires not only a positive attitude toward, but also an embracing of, the methods for promoting programmatic and systemic changes inherent within this mandate. Superintendents may exhibit beliefs about education commensurate with the Essentialist viewpoint. If this is the case, reformers may need to consider the implications of such a viewpoint in light of proposed reforms--directed toward affective needs and participatory planning--and related implementation timelines.

On the other hand, superintendents may exhibit Progressive attitudes toward restructuring. Factors beyond their personal commitments, however, may inhibit progress. If this is the case, those persons interested in supporting superintendents in educational reform endeavors should be aware of, and supportive of, the need to provide assistance in overcoming these barriers-to-practice.

As part of my dissertation (Department of Educational Administration, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville), Arkansas superintendents were requested to respond to a survey regarding their educational beliefs. What follows is a summary of the project, information about those who responded to the survey, and the results of the research.

Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the degree of Progressivism among Arkansas public school superintendents. In addition, the study was designed to ascertain the level of Arkansas superintendent support for current educational reform efforts, specifically Arkansas Act 236, and to identify variables other than belief systems that may be affecting the implementation of reform initiatives.

The Survey

The survey consisted of three parts. Part One was designed to obtain demographic data about the superintendents.

Part Two comprised 30-items for the purpose of identifying superintendent beliefs about education. Of the 30 items, 29 were adopted from a 68-item self-test on educational viewpoint for prospective teachers designed by Paul D. Travers and Ronald W. Rebore for their text Foundations of Education: Becoming a Teacher.[7]

Part Three of the survey contained four questions developed by the investigator. The purpose of the first question was to identify factors that superintendents believe were important in the formation of their personal attitudes toward education. The remaining three questions were created in order to obtain information on attitude toward, and factors contributing to and/or inhibiting restructuring efforts in Arkansas.

Results

A total of 249 (78%) of the 319 Arkansas superintendents responded to the survey. Tables 1 - 7 summarize the demographic information provided by the respondents. (See attached)

To determine the extent of Progressive educational beliefs of Arkansas superintendents, a set of 30 statements was provided combining Progressive and Essentialist educational viewpoints. Superintendents were requested to respond to each statement by circling one of five possible choices: "strongly agree," "agree," "undecided," "disagree," or "strongly disagree." Responses to all items were counted. A sum was derived from the number of responses indicating "strongly agree" and "agree" for the Progressive statements, and from the number of responses indicating "strongly disagree" or "disagree" for the Essentialist statements; thus, the count indicated the degree of Progressivism. A score of 30 was possible. The mean of 13.5 indicated that Arkansas superintendents, as a group, agreed with an almost equal number of Essentialist and Progressive beliefs, but showed a slight tendency toward Essentialism.

Table 8 shows the range and frequency of scores (3 - 26) for the 244 superintendents (100%) who completed the belief section of the survey. Table 9 shows the distribution of scores among the respondents. Statistical analysis revealed no practical relationship between superintendent demographic variables and the degree of Progressivism; therefore, no segment of the population was identified as more Progressive than any other segment.

Superintendents were requested to prioritize factors that influenced their views about education. Table 10 illustrates the results of that ranking.

Superintendents were asked to respond to the following statement: I believe that Arkansas schools are in need of restructuring. Table 11 shows the levels of superintendent agreement. Statistical analysis reflected that as the superintendent scores on Progressivism increased, so did their interest in restructuring.

As shown in Table 12, "local school board support" and "administrative attitude toward shared decision making" were factors identified most often as contributing to school district restructuring efforts. "Lack of money" was identified most often as the factor inhibiting restructuring efforts. Inhibitors are summarized in Table 13.

Conclusions and Implications

An undercurrent of Progressivism in education appears to be evident throughout the general population of Arkansas superintendents. The mean score on the beliefs inventory for this population does not reflect an embracing of Progressive beliefs. No demographic factors included in this study were found to be practically related to Progressivism; therefore, no segment of the population was identified as more Progressive than any other segment.

While little relationship was demonstrated between any demographic items and Progressivism, three relationships may warrant subsequent investigation:

1. The relationship between the extent of Progressivism and gender (r = -.2651). Although this represented one of the stronger correlations, it should be noted that the number of females responding to this study was limited (N = 10). The female population of Arkansas superintendents is, in itself, small (N = 15).
2. The relationship between the extent of Progressivism and the level of education (r = .2244). It may be that through formal university course work, one is exposed to a concentrated study of ideas, issues, and problems. Increased education, in turn, may lead to an increased understanding and adoption rate of Progressive beliefs.
3. The relationship between the extent of Progressivism and the agreement with the need to restructure (r = -.2640). Current reform endeavors associated with restructuring incorporate the practices of shared decision making, participatory planning, and consideration of affective needs. These practices are reflective of a Progressive rather than Essentialist viewpoint.

As a group, the superintendents in this study revealed beliefs commensurate with both Essentialist and Progressive points of view, but showed a slight tendency toward Essentialism. As previously mentioned, persons having an Essentialist orientation are less eager to experiment with educational change. In light of superintendent scores, persons eager for reform in education may need to examine their methods for promoting acceptance of programmatic and systemic changes inherent within reform endeavors. In addition, further investigation to determine areas of Progressivism with which superintendents most often agree may be warranted. These areas might include educational values and goals,

curricular content and purpose, and methods of and purpose for student discipline. If there are particular areas that superintendents approach in a more Progressive manner, such information might assist reformers in establishing goals and planning timelines for change.

Would the same findings on the extent of Progressivism among superintendents be reached if the study was replicated in other states, or regionally? Would further investigation of the superintendents representing the extreme scores reveal pertinent information? As none of the demographic variables included in this study appeared to strongly influence the development of a Progressive attitude on education, other demographic factors may be worthy of investigation. Such factors could include (1) the number of years living in-state, (2) the name/place of respondent's degree granting institution(s), (3) a list of state(s) in which one has had professional experience, and (4) identification of those holding membership in a group comprising professionals interested in restructuring. When considered as individual variables, however, demographic characteristics may not be strong influencing factors upon the extent, or development, of Progressive beliefs.

In reviewing what many superintendents cited as major influencing factors in shaping educational beliefs, it appears that for the majority of participants in this study, educational beliefs were formed before entering the superintendency. Superintendents most often reported that "classroom teaching experience" influenced the development of their educational beliefs. It would seem, then, that many members of this study view experiences during their years as principals and superintendents as having less influence in shaping their beliefs; however, even those persons rating graduate/ undergraduate degree programs," "professional reading," and "professional workshops/meetings" as primary influences, scored a mean of 13.6 on the beliefs inventory. This would seem to imply that these types of experiences do not necessarily lead to changing beliefs.

Perhaps an investigation of classroom practices is warranted in order to identify those practices that lead to certain beliefs. In addition, case studies of those having greater Progressive tendencies might prove worthwhile in determining the effect of beliefs upon practice; i.e., do what superintendents state as their beliefs correspond to their educational practice? Furthermore, graduates in education may profess certain beliefs upon graduation (e.g., Progressive), and those beliefs may change as a result of classroom experience (e.g., and become Essentialist). If this is the case, more intensive follow-up experiences between teacher educators and classroom teachers--the superintendents of tomorrow--may be warranted. Perhaps these experiences should take place within the new teacher's classroom rather than within the university, or other agency, setting.

The second most frequently cited influence upon shaping beliefs about education was "reflection upon experiences as a student." From the scores calculated on the beliefs inventory, one might infer that the majority of superintendents' student experiences were of an Essentialist orientation. If this is true, a circular phenomena may be occurring. This may be a case of, "I am doing this because it was what was done for me and it worked, so why change?" A profile of the superintendent's experiences as a student in grades 1 through 8, 9 through 12, as well as in college, might be worth investigating. Might a deeper and more thorough reflection of experiences occur as a result of guided reflection and discussion? Perhaps investigation of the kinds of questions one ask's when reflecting upon one's experience as a student is warranted.

As noted in Table 10, neither "undergraduate/graduate degree programs" nor "professional workshops" were considered to have much influence upon shaping educational beliefs. It may be that superintendents have experienced an inconsistency between the strategies used in such programs (e.g., lecture and telling) and the desired outcomes professed in such programs (e.g., active learning and collaboration). Persons involved in the design of educational course work and inservice training may be wise to reflect upon the kinds of experiences and activities being provided through, and the types of questions being asked of participants in, those programs.

In reviewing the responses to factors contributing to local restructuring efforts, one finds the elements related to school administration receiving the greatest number of tallies: i.e., school board support, administrative attitude toward shared decision making, principal support, and district goals and objectives. Interestingly, only one of these elements--district goals and objectives--can be addressed through directive. Directives, however, may only provide short-term solutions to long-term problems; after all, how often are complaints voiced about new directives that superintendents must implement? If the attitude toward the mandate is negative, how well is it carried out? More importantly, with site-based decision making as a consideration for many restructuring plans, directives from an authority or agency other than the local district appear inappropriate.

As noted in the previous paragraph, contributors to restructuring most often cited were administrative elements. These elements represent people over whom the superintendent may exert influence as well as those who are beyond university and Department of Education control. It may only be that when the board and principals agree on the importance of restructuring, and the superintendent views it as important, that the school fully engages in restructuring. If the major contributors to restructuring are, in fact, at the administrative level, it is with regard to all people at this level that positive attitudes toward restructuring must be promoted.

In view of the fact that Arkansas is involved in restructuring efforts, and because of the small but positive relationship found between the extent of Progressivism and the interest expressed in restructuring, investigation may be warranted--at both the state and local levels--as to the extent of Progressivism among Arkansas board members. As reflected in the data, superintendents identified board members as one of two primary factors contributing to restructuring efforts. The extent of Progressive beliefs among Arkansas board members may be commensurate with that of the superintendents who participated in this study. If this is the case, reformers may not only need to examine the types of existing programs-to-promote-change offered, but also the composition of audiences for whom those programs are provided.

Another area of consideration may involve the superintendent interview process. What kinds of questions might Arkansas boards of education interested in restructuring want to include in interviews of potential

63

superintendents? The data from this study suggest that many of the candidates for superintendency positions--specifically, those from the pool of existing Arkansas superintendents--hold beliefs reflective of both Progressive and Essentialist viewpoints, but with an assumed tendency toward Essentialism. If this is a true profile, board members interested in restructuring may need to develop a procedure for assessing the educational beliefs of its candidates.

"Lack of money" was identified most often as inhibiting restructuring efforts. Superintendents may be concerned about the need to shift already "tight" money to new programs and designs. They may believe that the current method of allocating district money to established programs is producing results, and they may question the promised educational results of new designs. This would be indicative of Essentialist tendencies.

Areas with which superintendents have had relatively little hands-on experience also were identified often as inhibiting restructuring efforts. For example, one-third of the superintendents identified "lack of experience with restructuring schools" as an inhibitor. Due to a lack of experience in restructuring schools, superintendents have little first-hand knowledge upon which to draw. Perhaps they have not yet, through the types of experiences provided thus far by those persons interested in reform, been able to internalize that the information about, and goals for, restructuring are valid and important. In addition, the concept of restructuring may be too much outside their personal experience to be easily accepted as worthwhile.

One-third of the superintendents also identified "concern about control of financial expenditures/decisions" as inhibiting restructuring efforts. Historically, budget decisions have been made at the administrative level with superintendents virtually controlling such decisions, and it is assumed that superintendents act in the best interest of the district in their decision-making endeavors. Site-based management, however, implies that funding decisions are the result of shared discussion among, and consensus by, all professional members of the district. Many superintendents may not have engaged in this process and experienced the benefit to all. Thus, superintendents actually may be more concerned with the "unknown" aspects of the process than with the "relinquishing of authority."

Summary

There does not appear to be a great extent of Progressivism in education among Arkansas superintendents. There does, however, appear to be some relationship between the extent of superintendent belief in Progressivism and the amount of interest expressed in Arkansas school restructuring.

Educational reformers in Arkansas presently are involved in trying to promote attitudes toward change. One problem being faced by reformers may involve the lack of superintendent understanding of the philosophical underpinnings associated with the restructuring concept. How many superintendents (and/or board members and/or teachers for that matter) view restructuring as just another gimmick? Many may lack a real understanding of the concepts underlying reform initiatives.

According to the results of this study, superintendents do not consider present attempts at changing attitudes as significant. All of the present factors representing attempts to influence beliefs--degree programs, workshops, professional reading--appeared low on this group of superintendents' lists of influences.

If the attitude is one of, "What I have done has impressed me the most," then perhaps it is time to investigate other possibilities by referring to things that have influenced superintendents. What would it take to create a similar type of influence? If experience is the primary influencing factor, perhaps there is a need for learning opportunities that replace the "lecture and telling" approaches rated as having so little impact by so many. This may be a case of superintendents (and board members) needing to "experience" that the knowledge is relevant and important.

Where are people having success in changing attitudes? Perhaps an investigation of success stories, through a case studies approach, is warranted. Is there a program for change that is working? Can this program be implemented elsewhere?

If the amount of agreement for restructuring is, in fact, positively related to increased Progressive beliefs about education, reformers may be wise to focus their attention on creating meaningful experiences designed to promote Progressive tendencies. They may need to design an environment in which superintendents can "experience" the relationship and relevance of reform to their own lives, as individuals and as members of the educational community. For if it is experience that truly and sincerely contributes to a change in attitudes, perhaps real education is exactly what John Dewey stated: the continuing reconstruction and reorganization of experience--experience in and through which new meanings can be discovered.

* * * *

My sincere gratitude is extended to SWEPS membership who encouraged and supported me in this endeavor. I wish to specifically recognize and thank Jim Bowman, Art Cooper, Ed Cullum, Charles Fazzaro, Spencer Maxcy, Franklin Parker, Ron Reed, Paul Travers, and Jim Van Patten.

Notes

[1]Richard F. Elmore and Associates, Restructuring Schools: The Next Generation of Educational Reform (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1990) 5.

[2]Van Cleve Morris, Philosophy and the American School (Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin, 1961) 460.

[3]Ronald C. Doll, Curriculum Improvement: Decision Making and Process (Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, 1992) 24.

[4]Ibid.

[5]Morris, op. cit., 453.

[6]Arkansas Act 236 of 1991. The intent of this legislation is to restructure education in Arkansas public

schools. Act 236 provides for the development of new forms of curricular frameworks, new and alternative forms of assessment commensurate with the curriculum, and new forms of professional development. The Act addresses instructional delivery systems as well as instructional materials. In addition, Arkansas Learner Outcomes have been established as a result of Act 236. These Outcomes represent state-level education goals concordant with national goals. Furthermore, three major task forces have been formed to assist in disseminating information about, and implementing Act 236: (1) Advisory Task Force--functions as the primary vehicle for making Act 236 known throughout the state; (2) Linkage Task Force--assumes responsibility for planning the implementation processes and procedures; (3) Teacher Licensure Task Force--serves as the planning committee for developing new standards for teacher licensure. In addition, the Arkansas Leadership Academy has been established with the goals of (1) providing training and leadership services in the areas of district support; leadership development; research, information, and technology; and minority identification and recruitment to those involved in and responsible for educating Arkansas youth, and (2) generating optimum learning environments in Arkansas public schools to support student achievement of national, state, and local education goals. (The preceding information was summarized from "Arkansas Leadership Academy." A brochure published by the Arkansas Leadership Academy, 153 Graduate Education Building, College of Education, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, AR. Further information on Act 236 also may be obtained through the Arkansas State Department of Education.)

[7]Paul D. Travers and Ronald W. Rebore, Foundations of Education: Becoming a Teacher (Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon, 1990) 69-72.

Table 1
Gender of Superintendents

Gender	N	%
Female	10	4
Male	230	96
No Response	9	0
Total	249	100

Table 2
Age of Superintendents

Age	N	%
25-30	0	0
31-35	1	<1
36-40	15	6
41-45	56	24
46-50	56	24
51-55	63	26
56- +	47	20
No Resp.	11	0
Total	249	100

Table 3
Level of Education

Level of Educ.	N	%
Bachelor's	1	<1
Master's	9	4
Master's + 30	121	49
Ed.S.	76	31
Doctorate	39	16
No Response	3	0
Total	249	100

Table 4
Years Administrative Experience

Type	N	Range	Mean	Med	Mode	Total
Superintendent	243	0.5 - 38	10.4	9	7	1237.5
Principal	166	0.5 - 22	6.3	5	2	1043.5

Table 5
Pre-Superintendency Experience

Position	N	%	Position	N	%
Classroom Teacher	232	93	Other Supervisor	18	7
Special Education	13	5	Asst. Principal	11	4
Principal	197	79	Counselor	8	3
Asst. Superintendent	22	9	Other	22	9

N = 249 Note: Includes responses to multiple categories.

Table 6
Grade Levels of Pre-Superintendency Experience

Position	N	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Classroom Teacher	187	16	14	102	5	5	37	8
Special Education	10	2	1	4	0	0	1	2
Principal	160	24	9	78	4	11	22	12

Note: (1) Elementary (2) Middle Level (3) High School
(4) Elementary/Middle (5) Elementary/High School
(6) Middle/High School (7) (K) 1 - 12

Table 7
Pre-Superintendency Number of Years Experience

Position	N	%	Range	Mean	Med	Mode	Total Yrs
Classroom Teacher	206	83	1.0-28	7.5	7	4	1544.5
Special Education	13	5	0.5-12	3.7	4	4	56.5
Principal	174	70	0.5-25	7.0	6	2,3	1241.0
Pre-Principal	198	80	0.5-28	7.7	7	6	1525.5

Table 8
Frequency of Scores

Score	No. of Scores	Score	No. of Scores
3	1	14	27
4	2	15	27
5	3	16	24
6	3	17	16
7	8	18	13
8	5	19	4
9	10	20	4
10	16	21	3
11	21	22	2
12	22	23	2
13	30	26	1

N = 244

Table 9
Distribution of Scores

Scores	N	%
3	1	<1
4 - 8	21	9
9 - 18	206	84
19 - 23	15	6
26	1	<1

Mean 13.5 Median 13
Mode 13 (N = 30)

Table 10
Factors Influencing Educ. Beliefs

Factor	N	%
Classroom Teaching	134	55
Reflection upon Experiences	45	19
Degree Programs	18	7
Colleagues	16	7
Workshops	8	3
Reading	7	3
Other	15	6
Total	242	100

Table 11
Superintendent View on the Need for Restructuring Arkansas Schools

View	N	%
Strongly Agree	25	10
Agree	106	43
Undecided	32	13
Disagree	45	18
Strongly Disagree	13	5
No Response	28	11
Total	249	100

Table 12
Superintendent Responses on Factors Contributing to Local Restructuring Efforts

Factor	N	%
Local School Board Support	159	64
Administrative Attitude Toward Shared Decision Making	159	64
Building Principal Support	153	61
District Goals and Objectives	144	58
Teacher Willingness/ Enthusiasm	127	51
Professional Training	113	45
Community Support	105	42
Department of Educ. Support	105	42
Parental Support	99	40
On-Site Visits	68	27
Money	65	26
University Support	36	14
Other	6	2
No Response	13	5

N = 249

Table 13
Superintendent Responses on Factors Inhibiting Local Restructuring Efforts

Factor	N	%
(Lack of...)		
Money	171	69
Experience with Restructuring Schools	88	35
Control of Finances	86	35
Teacher Willingness	76	31
Department of Education Support	48	19
Professional Training	47	19
Parental Support	41	16
Community Support	39	16
University Support	35	14
Principal(s) Support	26	10
School Board Support	24	10
Administrative Attitude Toward Shared Decision Making	24	10
Appropriate Goals and Objectives	22	9
Other	10	4
No Response	16	6

N = 249

Education Philanthropist George Peabody (1795-1869), George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, and the Peabody Library and Conservatory of Music, Baltimore: A Brief History

Franklin and Betty J. Parker
Western Carolina University

George Peabody, Education Philanthropist. George Peabody, Massachusetts-born merchant and securities broker, whose banking firm in London was the root of the House of J.P. Morgan, is also important for the following educational philanthropies:

- •A $2 million Peabody Education Fund (PEF) to promote public schools and teacher training in 12 Civil War-devastated southern states. (George Peabody College for Teachers of Vanderbilt University is the PEF legatee.)
- •Three museums of science: Ethnology and Archaeology at Harvard, Natural Science at Yale, and Maritime History in Salem, MA
- •The Baltimore Peabody Institute Library and Peabody Conservatory of Music, both now part of the Johns Hopkins University.
- •Six institute libraries whose lecture halls served adult education in Massachusetts, DC, and Vermont.
- •Low-cost model housing in London for working people, unique for its time, where some 19,000 people still live. But first, Peabody's career.

Commercial Career. Born poor in then Danvers, now Peabody, MA (18 miles from Boston), he had four short years of schooling. Apprenticed in a general store, he then worked in his older brother's drapery shop in Newburyport, MA. He later went with an uncle to open a store in Georgetown, DC. Still in his teens, serving briefly in the War of 1812, he met fellow soldier and experienced merchant Elisha Riggs. A partnership in mercantile trade with the Riggs family began his commercial rise in Georgetown, Baltimore, Philadelphia, and New York. Ten buying trips to Europe followed, and over 30 years' residence in London as merchant-broker-banker, 1837-69.

Merchant and Securities Broker. Maryland commissioned him to sell its $8 million bond issue in Europe for canals, railroads, and other internal improvements. Because of the Panic of 1837, Maryland and other states could not pay interest on their bonds. Convinced that the states would honor their obligations, Peabody bought many of these bonds cheaply and later profited. In 1843 his new firm, George Peabody and Co., dealt in American securities financing western railroads, the Mexican War loan, and the Atlantic Cable Co. Young J. P. Morgan, son of Peabody's partner J. S. Morgan (partner after 1854), began his career as the New York representative of George Peabody and Co., which was thus the root of the J. P. Morgan banking firm.

Early Fame. Some fame came when he lent American exhibitors funds to display American products at the 1851 London Crystal Palace Great Exhibition, the first world's fair. More fame came from his annual July Fourth dinners in London, also from 1851. He brought together English and American guests at a time when Britons generally disdained Americans.

Early Philanthropy. Unable to attend his home town of Danvers' hundredth anniversary in 1852, he sent a check and a sentiment: "Education—a debt due from present to future generations." Thus began the first of his six Peabody institute libraries with lecture halls and lecture funds (plus, in Baltimore, an art gallery and music conservatory) and other educational gifts mentioned above. A letter to a nephew whose schooling at Yale College Peabody paid for hints at his philanthropic motive:

> Deprived as I was of the opportunity of obtaining anything more than the most common education, I am well qualified to estimate its value by the disadvantages I labor under in the society which my business and situation in life frequently throws me, and willingly would I now give twenty times the expense attending a good education could I now possess it, but it is now too late for me....I can only do to those who come under my care, as I could have wished circumstances had permitted others to have done by me.

Peabody Education Fund (PEF)

Background. For 47 years (1867-1914) trustees and agents of the $2 million Peabody Education Fund worked to advance public schools and teacher training in the former Confederate states. It is interesting to see from the historical record and present perspective founder George Peabody's intent, how the Fund was spent, how it served separate White, Black, and racially mixed schools; how it advanced teacher education through teacher institutes, state normal schools, and educational journals; why the PEF chose to support the normal school in Nashville as a model for the South; why it was important to the South and to the nation; its influence and educational legacy to the present.

The PEF served the eleven defeated southern states: Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia. A twelfth state, West Virginia, was added because of its Appalachian isolation and poverty. These states repealed their ordinances of secession (West Virginia came into the Union at statehood in 1863) and tried to reclaim their seats in the national Congress. They were initially refused admission by radical Republicans who won the November 1866 elections and were determined to punish the South. Northern sentiment was bent on punishment. Southern resentment naturally followed. On regaining control of their state governments, southern leaders enacted state jim crow laws to counter federal

laws granting the former slaves emancipation and equality. Anger and animosity prevailed. Sectional rivalry was intense.

Post-Civil War Education Decline. The South was near ruin. Its property fell to half its pre-war value. The few pre-Civil War public school systems and private schools were sorely curtailed. Illiteracy among the 5.5 million southern Whites increased during the war and was estimated between 20 percent and 30 percent. Nearly all of the 3.5 million former slaves were illiterate.

George Peabody's February 7, 1867, letter founding the Peabody Fund was largely seen as an important symbol of reconciliation. "I give to you gentlemen," his letter stated, one million dollars for education in the southern and southwestern states. This amount was doubled to $2 million in July 1869. An additional $1.5 million given in Mississippi bonds and $384,000 in Florida bonds was repudiated by those states.

Southern Acceptance. Southerners accepted the Fund as a generous and practical way to heal civil war wounds. Robert E. Lee and southern leaders warmly greeted George Peabody at an informal, unplanned meeting in White Sulphur Springs, WV, in August 1869. Peabody's founding letter envisioned a bright future for the reunited country: "I see our country, united and prosperous, emerging from the clouds which still surround her, taking a higher rank among the nations, and becoming richer and more powerful than ever before." Harmony to replace vindictiveness was shown in his sentence: "It is the duty and privilege of the more favored and wealthy portions of our nation's countrymen to assist those who are less fortunate."

PEF Planners. Four men were responsible for the origin and early direction of the PEF. George Peabody's $2 million endowed it. Massachusetts statesman Robert Charles Winthrop was the philanthropic advisor who suggested and secured the early trustees. The stature and geographic balance of the trustees gave the fund its national character and popular acceptance. Winthrop, who chaired the Board of Trustees for 27 years, helped select the third individual, Barnas Sears, as the Fund's first administrator, called agent. Sears, a public school champion, succeeded Horace Mann as Massachusetts State Board of Education secretary. Sears' administration of the PEF set many precedents followed by later philanthropic foundations; one precedent was that a grant be contingent on local matching funds and state tax support to perpetuate public schools and state normal schools.

Weed's Explanation of PEF Origin. Thurlow Weed, fourth planner, explained the PEF's origin. He was a New York State politician, editor of the Albany (NY) *Evening Journal*, and a Peabody advisor. Peabody had consulted Weed about his intended gifts when Weed was in London in 1851, again in London in 1861 (when Weed was President Lincoln's emissary to keep Britain and France from aiding the Confederacy), and in 1866 during Peabody's 1866-67 visit to the United States. When asked to direct Peabody's educational plans, Weed named Robert C. Winthrop as a more suitable director. To defend George Peabody against charges of treasonable aid to the South during and after the Civil War, Weed told what he knew of the PEF's origin.

Garrison's Charge of Treason. Abolitionist William Lloyd Garrison and others, before and after George Peabody's death, believed (erroneously) that Peabody had treasonably aided the South before and during the Civil War. Garrison's first scathing article in New York City's *Independent*, August 16, 1869, charged that Peabody's gift creating the Peabody Institute of Baltimore (1857) was made when Maryland was "rotten" with treason. In 1869 (paraphrasing Garrison's condemnation), an old and ill Peabody, true to his southern sympathies, went to recuperate not to a northern spa but to a southern one, White Sulphur Spring, WV (still thought of by Northerners as Virginia), the favorite resort of the elite of "rebeldom," who welcomed him with congratulatory resolutions, to which he responded by speaking of his own cordial esteem and regard for the high honor, integrity, and heroism of the southern people.

George Peabody's $2 million Education Fund, Garrison complained, did not aid needy Negro children, but went to White children; the conservative trustees and agent Barnas Sears chose to comply with rather than to fight school segregation laws in the southern states.

Garrison's second attack, three months after Peabody's death on November 4, 1869, was titled "Honored Beyond His Deserts," in the *Independent*, February 10, 1870. Garrison mocked the pomp and circumstance attending George Peabody's death in London, lying in state at Westminster Abbey, transport of remains across the Atlantic on Britain's newest warship, H.M.S. *Monarch*, escorted by U.S. naval vessels to an impressive reception at Portland harbor, ME, and burial amid solemn ceremony in Salem, MA. Peabody's motive in his philanthropy, Garrison wrote, as it was in returning to England to die, was to gain public attention, "to quickly make him[self] famous." Peabody was a pro-slaver, Garrison charged, citing as proof the fact that he (George Peabody) had signed an appeal denouncing Massachusetts' "Personal Liberty Bill." That bill prohibited southern slave hunters from removing from Massachusetts slaves who had fled their southern masters. In this, Garrison mistakenly confused educational philanthropist George Peabody (1795-1869) for a remote Boston relative of the same name, George Peabody (1804-92) of Salem, MA, Eastern Railroad president who had favored the Fugitive Slave Law.

Garrison saw the South as the enemy long after the Civil War. He raged at George Peabody because the PEF was intended to revive the South. To correct Garrison's injudicious rage and misconceptions, Thurlow Weed told what he knew of the PEF's origin.

The money Peabody gave for the southern education fund was intended, Weed explained, until well after the Civil War, for New York City's poor. But the war and its effects changed Peabody's mind. New York City had prospered and had long supported public schools, while the poverty-stricken South had few public schools. When northern friends approved of his intended education fund to aid southern education, Peabody went to Weed, who helped name some trustees and suggested Winthrop, who in turn named others and developed the overall plan.

PEF's Northern Acceptance. President Andrew Johnson's visit to an old and ailing George Peabody at Washington, DC's Willard Hotel, February 9, 1867, was an act of respect recognizing the PEF as a national gift meant to heal the divided nation. When the U.S. Congress on March 16, 1867, voted unanimous thanks to George Peabody, "for his great and peculiar beneficence" and ordered "a Gold Medal struck (for him) in the

name of the people of the United States," it was also to show national thanks for the PEF.

First Administrator Barnas Sears. Publicity about the Peabody Fund before its trustees had set policy brought many requests for money, some of them strange indeed. Pondering what the PEF's policy should be, Robert Winthrop sounded out Barnas Sears, president of Brown University, whom he met by chance in Boston just before the March 19, 1867, PEF trustees' meeting. Winthrop asked Sears how he thought the trustees should carry out their work. In Sears' answer, Winthrop later wrote, he found the PEF's first director.

Winthrop had chaired the legislative committee which drafted the bill creating Massachusetts' first state board of education (1837), had persuaded Horace Mann to become its first secretary, and knew how ably Sears had succeeded Mann in that position. Winthrop also admired Sears' subsequent career as Newton Theological Seminary president and, at their meeting, Brown University president

Sears advised Winthrop and the trustees to appoint an executive agent to visit schools, consult with southern leaders, aid deserving public schools where they existed, or establish them; and to use limited Peabody funds for schools which local authorities would support and the state would perpetuate through taxes. Sears suggested the same support for state normal schools, with scholarships for those who would teach for two years. Winthrop asked Sears to record these ideas in a letter. After Sears' letter of March 14, 1867, was discussed by the trustees, they asked him to be the PEF's first general agent.

Southern Preference for Private Schools. Southerners viewed education as a family responsibility, conducted in a private school charging tuition cost. Public schools were less than second best. Only North Carolina and Louisiana of the eleven former Confederate states had attempted pre-Civil War comprehensive public schools and these had nearly collapsed. Virginia, Georgia, and South Carolina provided free schools for pauper children. Free schools were looked down upon by upper and middle class people, who preferred private academies for their children. Impoverished families, from pride, kept their children at home rather than bear the public stigma of being poor.

Sears Sets Policy. Moving his family to Staunton, VA, from where he made extensive southern trips, Sears soon visited nearly 100 larger towns and cities. He saw that southerners of all classes were reluctant to pay taxes for public schools. Other hurdles were state laws that segregated White and Black schools. There were also some state-mandated racially mixed schools. Knowing that the millions in need would soon deplete Peabody funds, Sears' first annual report (January 21, 1868) stated that the PEF would aid only public schools and state normal schools in economically advanced towns and cities where large numbers of students could be gathered, where local authorities would vote taxes to perpetuate them as public schools, and where such PEF-aided schools became models for other communities. When Sears found state and local officials devoted to tax supported public schools, he gave them Fund-aid guidelines and appointed them sub-agents with discretionary power to spend Peabody funds as needed in keeping with local concerns.

Sears devised a scale of Peabody Fund aid for schools meeting at least nine or ten months a year, having at least one teacher per 50 pupils, with the community matching Peabody funds by two and often three times the amount of Peabody aid. Schools so aided had to be under public control, thus paving the way for state supervision. The intent was to increase community involvement and interest that led to permanent tax support. Aid increased as enrollments rose: $300 a year for a school enrolling up to 100 pupils, $450 for 100-150 pupils, $600 for 150-200 pupils, $800 for 200-250 pupils, and $1,000 for 300 or more pupils. Sears thus used the Fund's limited resources as a lever for wielding more than local influence and as a step toward permanent state tax support.

Atlanta, GA, is an example of how Sears countered anti-public school sentiment. He learned on his first visit in 1867 that Atlanta had 60 private schools and no public schools. Sears offered $2,000 if the city would establish public schools. Nothing happened. Repeating his offer two years later, it was accepted. Atlanta adopted a public school plan in 1870. Two years later (1872), Atlanta's public schools enrolled 2,731 children; private schools enrolled only 75 children. The Atlanta experience showed that Peabody funds were small compared to total public school cost but important as a stimulus, model, and moral force.

Different White-Black School Policy. Few schools met Sears' requirements for aid during the first four years (1867-71). Over the next few years (1871-74), many White communities were able but Black communities remained largely unable to meet those conditions. After 1874 Sears was able to approve funds for half or fewer of the many applicants. On his early trips, Sears found Black schools better provided for than were White schools. This anomaly resulted from the large initial aid for Black schools during 1865-74 by the federal Freedmen's Bureau, northern missionaries, and northern teachers—all aiding Black but not White schools. Sears found southern Whites bitterly resentful of northern outsiders' intrusion.

Sears recommended to Winthrop in 1869 that Black schools should get only two-thirds the amount for White schools. His justification (rightly or wrongly) was that Black schools cost less to maintain and had been exclusively helped by federal aid and northern missionaries during 1865-74. "Some will find fault with our making any distinction between the two races," he warned Winthrop. The trustees approved this policy. From 1870-71 onward, although Peabody funds aided many Black schools, their rate of aid was two-thirds the rate for White schools.

Criticism and Defense. Critics then and since have faulted Sears for the two-thirds Black schools discriminatory rate and also for opposing racially mixed schools. Sears' biographer Earle H. West's explanation is that Sears, concerned to carry out the Peabody Fund's mission to aid public schools and teacher training, strictly avoided social strife and meddling in politics. "Let the people themselves settle the question" of separate schools, Sears said. He would aid racially mixed schools, he said, when mandated by state law and when both races attended. But where Whites refused to send their children to state-mandated racially mixed schools, then the Peabody Fund trustees felt they had to aid White children who would otherwise grow up in ignorance.

Integrated Schools. South Carolina for a time and Louisiana for a longer time under radical Reconstruction governments had racially mixed schools. In 1868 the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Peabody trustees took the position that since Louisiana's racially mixed public schools served almost entirely Black pupils and few White pupils, Peabody funds would go to White schools, even though they were private. Thus caught up in racial politics in Louisiana, the Peabody Fund was praised by pro-Whites but criticized as racist by pro-Black radicals. Sears' reply to this criticism was that the Peabody Fund wished to educate the entire community. If mixed schools resulted in Black-only schools, he said, then the Peabody Fund would have to aid the more school-needy White children. He added, "We should give the preference to colored children were they in like circumstances."

Sears was also criticized for testifying before a Congressional committee in January 1874 against a clause in the Civil Rights Act (passed in March 1875) requiring racially mixed public schools. His experience in southern communities, he said, convinced him that southern leaders would abandon public schools rather than accept federally enforced racially mixed public schools. Black and White children would then suffer alike, he said, and the vast educational efforts of the Peabody Fund and other educational foundations in the South would be for nothing. Congress removed the racially mixed public school requirement clause before passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1875. Sears and the Peabody Fund won southern respect but also some northern criticism.

Was Sears Racist? Earle H. West's explanation is that, faced with the reality of schools racially separated by state law and the fact that southerners would not send their children to racially mixed schools, Sears felt he had to go along with school segregation. To achieve longer range public school improvements and until southerners accepted racial equality in schools, Sears saw segregated schools as the legal constraint under which the PEF had to function. To have stood against southern state school segregation laws would have limited, more likely ended, the PEF's work and influence

Recent Critics Say Yes. Recent revisionist historians have criticized the Fund's influence on Black education. William P. Vaughn wrote that Sears and the PEF perpetuated racial segregation in southern schools. Historian Henry J. Perkinson felt that, by going along with racially separate schools, the Peabody Fund "prevented the South from attaining educational equality with the North for the next seventy-five years." Vaughn, Perkinson, and other recent revisionist critics judge Sears and the Peabody Fund in light of the hard-fought civil rights achievements of the 1960s and '70s. A century earlier, in the 1870s and '80s, Sears and the Peabody Fund trustees had to deal with racial attitudes and southern state laws as they found them. Sears' stand in Louisiana of aiding private White schools because White parents would not send their children to racially mixed schools made the PEF's influence in Louisiana less successful and more controversial than in any other southern state.

Historians Praise PEF. Up to about 1950, historians' general praise of the work and influence of the PEF may have been because the PEF was the first large fund by a private individual to help public education in the post-Civil War South, because the Fund's assistance came when desperately needed, because its trustees were prominent and respected northerners and southerners, and because its policy harmonized with southern middle and upper class interests. The praise of earlier historians is followed by recent criticism.

E. Merton Coulter: "The greatest act of help and friendship that came to the South during the Reconstruction originated with George Peabody, Massachusetts-born English banker and benefactor....The South was deeply moved by this beam of light piercing their blackest darkness."

Harvey Wish: "Northern philanthropy tried to fill the gap left by Southern poverty and by Bourbon indifference to elementary education. No kindness had touched the hearts of Southerners quite as much as the huge educational bequest of the Massachusetts-born financier, George Peabody of England."

Edgar W. Knight: "The Peabody Fund was a highly beneficial influence to education in the South." (In another book): "The Peabody Fund...was not only the earliest manifestation of a spirit of reconciliation on the part of the Northern man toward the southern states, but it was also one of the largest educational blessings which ever came from the outside to that section of the country."

Paul H. Buck: "As in his [George Peabody's] gifts to England he had hoped to link two nations in friendly bonds, now after the Civil War it seemed to him most imperative to use his bounty in the restoration of good will between North and South...." (In another book): "The Peabody Education Fund...was an experiment in harmony and understanding between the sections." (Again he wrote): "Not only was the gift of Peabody one of the earliest manifestations of a spirit of reconciliation, but it was also a most effective means of stimulating that spirit in others."

Abraham Flexner: "The trustees of the Peabody Fund were a distinguished group of men. No body of trust has ever contained men of higher character, greater ability and eminence, or more varied experience."

William Knox Tate: "No sketch of Southern education should close without an expression of gratitude to our friends in the days of darkness—George Peabody and the Peabody Board of Trustees. No other $3,000,000 [sic, $1.5 million of Mississippi and $384,000 in Florida bonds were never honored by those states, making a total $2 million fund] ever accumulated on the earth has done so beneficent a work as has this fund."

J. L. M. Curry: "Among the benefactors of education none have surpassed George Peabody in the timeliness and utility of his gift."

Daniel Coit Gilman: "Mr. George Peabody began this line of modern beneficence...." (About the Peabody Fund): "The influence exerted by this agency [Peabody Education Fund] throughout the states which were impoverished by the war cannot be calculated, and it is not strange that the name of George Peabody is revered from Baltimore to New Orleans...." (About post-Civil War southern philanthropy): "Almost if not quite all of these foundations have been based on principles that were designated by Mr. Peabody."

Thomas D. Clark: "Since 1867 the Peabody Fund has worked as an educational leaven, and by the beginning of the twentieth century such matters as consolidation, compulsory attendance, teacher training, vocational education and general lifting of Southern standards received ardent editorial support. Especially was this true in the first decade of this century when the famous education publicity crusades were under way."

Charles William Dabney: "George Peabody [was] the first of the line of philanthropists to aid the Southern states in their struggle for education after the Civil War." [And]: "The gift of Mr. Peabody in its purpose to help cure the sores of a distressed people by giving them aid for a constructive plan of education was original and unique. It was not for the mere relief of suffering; it was to lay the foundations for future peace and prosperity through enlightenment and training. In this sense he was a pioneer of a new philanthropy, which did not seek only to palliate, or merely to eliminate the causes of evil and distress, but to build up a better and stronger human society."

William Torrey Harris: "It would appear to the student of education in the Southern States that the practical wisdom in the administration of the Peabody Fund, and the fruitful results that have followed it, could not be surpassed in the history of endowments."

Jesse Brundage Sears: "This [the Peabody Education Fund], as our first experiment, must be pronounced a decided success and it must stand as an excellent precedent both for the future public and for the future philanthropist."

PEF in Alabama. Recent historian Kenneth R. Johnson wrote that while the Peabody Fund's influence in Alabama "was a praiseworthy one, it has been overemphasized." The free school provision in Alabama's 1868 constitution was in the planning stage when Sears first toured the South, including Alabama, in July 1868. Peabody Fund aid was given to schools in several Alabama cities, first through Alabama's local and state officials acting as PEF sub-agents. Later Peabody Fund aid went through the Alabama state superintendent of education. Despite limited resources, the average school enrollment in Alabama public schools increased during 1870-75 from 35,963 to 91,202 White children and from 16,097 to 54,595 Black children. The Peabody Fund expenditure in Alabama during 1868-1905 (37 years) totaled $79,200.

Historian Johnson doubted the assertion in Curry's *History of the Peabody Fund*, 1898, that the Fund was primarily responsible for establishing the public school systems in the southern states. "Had Dr. Curry been more objective and his research more thorough, [his] conclusions might have been different." Alabama public schools, Johnson wrote, were established with state money and by state officials. "Despite claims to the contrary, the Peabody fund was not important financially to Alabama's public school system." What limited the Peabody Fund's influence in Alabama, Johnson explained, was its policy of aiding only town schools with large numbers of pupils. Alabama's population as late as 1890 was 85.2 percent rural. Helping well-run town schools, he wrote, did not encourage similar rural school growth. (Sears' rejoinder to this criticism was that millions of children were in need and to have catered to the overwhelming number of rural school needs would have soon depleted the Fund's limited resources.)

The Peabody Fund's policy of not aiding private schools, Johnson admitted, helped undermine their earlier importance. The Fund's policy of requiring local matching funds stimulated the more well-to-do to accept regular school taxes. The positive consequence of this policy was to remove the "charity" stigma from public schools. Agents Sears and Curry's travels and speeches also fostered the idea that public education was every child's right and not a privilege.

Johnson faulted the Peabody Fund's acceptance of segregated schools, its two-thirds Black school discriminatory policy, and the Fund's acceptance of the assumption "that though Negroes should be educated, they were not as deserving as Whites.... Peabody [Fund] officials did not initiate this anti-Negro attitude," wrote Johnson, "but their policy tended to confirm existing prejudices."

Curry and Teacher Training. J. L. M. Curry made the claim to the Peabody Fund trustees (1900) that "the normal schools of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Alabama, and Texas are the direct...result of the General Agents and of your timely benefactions." Historian Johnson called this an overstatement, citing the following Alabama example.

To get Peabody Fund money, private academies and colleges offered to establish normal departments. The Peabody Fund rejected these offers, fearing that private normal schools would hinder Peabody-preferred state-supported normal schools. In 1872, Alabama had one normal school (in Florence); in the 1880s four normal schools for Whites and two for Blacks; and in 1890 four for Whites and three for Blacks. The Peabody Fund did not found these normal schools but aided them after 1882 and also funded Peabody Normal Institutes (one-month summer sessions) during 1890-98. At Florence Normal School in the 1890s the Peabody Fund helped establish a model school for seniors to practice their teaching under supervision.

After the Peabody Fund's first focus on supporting public schools, it turned to training teachers in teacher institutes and in normal schools. As Massachusetts Board of Education secretary (1849-55), Sears had supervised that state's normal schools, the first in the nation. As Peabody Fund agent, he insisted on aiding only state-supported normal schools. In 1867, when the Peabody Fund began, there were 21 normal schools in the U.S., 20 of these outside the South and only one in West Virginia. Five years later (1872), there were 42 normal schools in the U.S., six of them in the southern states. After 1878 Peabody Fund policy focused its resources mainly on aiding normal schools. On April 28, 1879, a year before his death, Sears wrote to Winthrop, "On the whole it now looks as if we should carry out our new plan—the improvement of teachers —as successfully as we did our first—the establishment of schools."

Curry, Sears' successor and second agent during 1881-1903, led the Fund's second phase of aiding teacher training through teacher institutes, normal schools, and educational journals. Curry financed many teacher institutes, which were two-to-four-week gatherings of teachers and administrators offering lectures about classroom instruction and school administration. He valued the professional training aspects of teacher institutes and normal schools and extolled the favorable public sentiment they created for public schools. Between 1883-92, under Curry, 86 percent of the Fund's expenditures went for teacher training.

PEF Importance and Influence. The PEF was the source for the educational leadership of Barnas Sears, J. L. M. Curry, Wickcliffe Rose (Curry's successor as PEF agent), and others in late nineteenth century and early twentieth century education foundations serving both races in the South. Samuel F. Slater openly acknowledged the influence of the PEF on his creating the Slater Fund for Negro Education in the South. Curry and Rose

73

were agents for both the Peabody and Slater funds. Several Peabody Fund trustees also served both of these and other funds. Curry's history of the PEF states that George Peabody's philanthropic example directly influenced Paul Tulane to found Tulane University in New Orleans and Anthony J. Drexel to found Drexel Institute in Philadelphia.

Curry cited the impressive influence of the PEF trustees. Among them at different times were three U.S. Presidents (U.S. Grant, Rutherford B. Hayes and Grover Cleveland), two U.S. Supreme Court chief justices (Thomas Manning and Morrison R. Waite), several state court justices, famous military leaders of the Union (Admiral David G. Farragut) and the Confederacy, two bishops, several members of Congress, U.S. cabinet members (Alexander H. Stuart, U.S. Secretary of the Interior; and Hamilton Fish, U.S. Secretary of State), ambassadors (Henry R. Jackson of Georgia, Minister to Mexico), city mayors, state governors (William Aiken of South Carolina and William A Graham of North Carolina), financiers (Anthony J. Drexel and J. Pierpont Morgan), and others.

PEF and Later Southern Educational Philanthropy. The Southern Education Board, founded in 1901, grew out of the four conferences for education in the South; these grew inevitably out of the work of the PEF, with Curry and others being connected with all three. In 1902 John D. Rockefeller's General Education Board was responsible for significant educational philanthropy, again with Curry and others from the Southern Education Board among its members. During 1902-13, it is difficult to distinguish among the programs and work of the PEF, the John F. Slater Fund, the Conference for Education in the South, the Southern Education Board, the General Education Board, the Rosenwald Fund, and the Anna T. Jeanes Foundation, all working to improve conditions in the South. There was the closest cooperation between the trustees, officers, and directors of these various boards and funds.

The common problem was to uplift the southern poor, to gain southern acceptance of public education, to encourage state and local laws that perpetuated tax-supported public schools, and to initiate and spur both teacher institutes and teacher training normal schools. The Peabody Fund, first in this area, was also the first U.S. multi-million dollar foundation with a positive attitude toward solving social ills; first without religious conditions; first whose influence was national, as its scope was regional and local; first to provide for future modifications as conditions changed; and first to set a pattern of selected trustees from the professions and business. The PEF established principles and precedents adopted by later foundations. It was a model and guidepost, influencing practically all subsequent philanthropic efforts in the South and the nation.

George Peabody College for Teachers

Peabody Normal College Origins. In 1875 the PEF trustees decided to make the normal school in Nashville a model for the South. The Nashville normal school began with University of Nashville Chancellor John Berrien Lindsley who, in the early 1870s, tried but failed to get Tennessee state support for a normal department at his university. Unable to get funds from the legislature and quick to see benefits from a PEF connection, he asked Peabody Fund trustees to help establish a normal school. Sears agreed and, by one account, said to Tennessee Governor James D. Porter in 1875:

> I have just returned from a visit to every capital in the South and have decided to establish the Peabody Normal College in Tennessee. I have reported to [my Trustees] that Nashville is the best place.... [We hope] to make it a great teachers college for the whole South and I want your active cooperation.

Governor Porter got the legislature that year to amend the University of Nashville's charter, substituting for its moribund literary department a normal school to which the Peabody Education Fund promised $6,000 annually. Sears expected state funding but the Tennessee legislature adjourned without such action. To save the project, Sears in May 1875 proposed that if the University of Nashville trustees donated buildings and grounds and an amount from its small endowment for a normal school, the Peabody Fund would give its promised $6,000 annually.

Normal College President Stearns. In September 1875 Eben S. Stearns became president of State Normal College. He was a New England educator of considerable stature whom Sears (when Sears was secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education) had appointed second president of West Newton Normal School, MA, the first U.S. normal school. Under Stearns, the State (later Peabody) Normal College opened December 1, 1875, with 13 young women students and a faculty of three, and ended the year with 60 students.

To Sears' dismay, the Tennessee legislature did not vote funds for State (i.e., Peabody) Normal College during 1875-77. In 1878 Sears looked into moving the Normal College teaching staff to Georgia or another southern state with guaranteed state support. Georgia's legislature passed a bill appropriating $6,000 annually for a Georgia State Normal School if the PEF would appropriate an equal amount annually. This proposed move to Georgia stirred action by Nashvillians, who pledged to pay $4,000 annually until Tennessee state aid took over. In 1881 the Tennessee legislature finally appropriated $10,000 annually.

The Peabody-funded Normal College's three-year course, after high school preparation, led to a diploma, the Licentiate of Instruction. In 1878 the Normal College added a fourth year and a bachelor's degree. PEF support from 1875 was largely through two-year competitive Peabody scholarships at $200 a year for exceptional young men and women from the southern states. These prestigious Peabody scholarships required that recipients continue their college studies for two years and teach at least two years in their state after finishing their studies. During 1875-1909, 3,751 such Peabody scholarships were awarded.

Presidents W.H. Payne and James D. Porter. President Stearns died in April 1887. After an uneasy interim, William Harold Payne became president in 1888. W. H. Payne was an educator of national distinction, having held the first U.S. professorship of education at the University of Michigan during 1879-88. In 1888, during W. H. Payne's administration (1888-1901), the Tennessee State Board of Education officially recognized George Peabody's contribution by confirming the name Peabody Normal College. W. H. Payne was succeeded by former Tennessee Governor James D. Porter, who served during 1901-09. Near the end of

Porter's administration, the PEF endowed the renamed George Peabody College for Teachers with over one million dollars, contingent on matching gifts. President Porter raised matching money required by the PEF donation: $250,000 from the State of Tennessee, $200,000 from the City of Nashville, $100,000 from Davidson County, and $250,000 property from the University of Nashville.

Peabody College Lineage Since 1785. Thus, as part of the University of Nashville, Peabody College took its place in a distinguished academic lineage that is over 200 years old. That lineage began with Davidson Academy, chartered by the North Carolina legislature in 1785 when Nashville on the Cumberland River was only five years old and Tennessee was still part of North Carolina. Davidson Academy, 1785-1806, was rechartered as Cumberland College, 1806-26; rechartered as the University of Nashville, 1826-75; rechartered as State Normal College (aided by the PEF), 1875-1909 (renamed Peabody Normal College in 1889); rechartered as George Peabody College for Teachers on Hillsboro Road near Vanderbilt, 1909-79; and rechartered as George Peabody College for Teachers of Vanderbilt University on July 1, 1979. Peabody College always had both a teacher education focus and a liberal arts component, later adding programs in rural education, library science, art, music, physical education, special education, and educational field surveys.

Comparisons 1905. Peabody College, with this distinguished academic lineage, teacher education mission, and a seemingly bright financial future, was always private, had a small but strong faculty, and graduated a relatively small number of educators, some of whom achieved distinction. A 1905 comparison of the Peabody Normal College faculty with the faculty of 51 other U.S. normal schools showed that 21 percent of Peabody faculty had doctoral degrees compared to 11 percent in other normal schools; 67 percent of Peabody faculty had attended colleges outside the South (one-third of these at Harvard, Columbia, the Johns Hopkins, Chicago, and Cornell universities); and ten percent had studied at European universities.

Vanderbilt University, Nashville. The Vanderbilt-Peabody connection began with the founding of those two independent institutions of higher education in Nashville, TN. Vanderbilt University was chartered on August 6, 1872, as the Central University of the Methodist Episcopal Church South. Southern Methodist leaders and especially Methodist Bishop Holland N. McTyeire worked diligently for its founding. In February 1873 Bishop McTyeire visited Commodore Cornelius Vanderbilt in New York City (their wives were intimately related). Vanderbilt had made his fortune in steamship lines (hence "Commodore") and then in railroads. They talked about the Civil War's devastating effect on the South. Vanderbilt said he would like to do something for the South. Bishop McTyeire told him of the difficulty in raising money for the new Southern Methodist university buildings in Nashville. Vanderbilt donated $500,000 on March 12, 1873, later raising the amount to $1 million. The institution was renamed Vanderbilt University on June 6, 1873, and buildings were started. Instruction began October 3, 1875, with a faculty of 26 professors, five of whom had been college presidents, and a student body of 307 young men, all but 18 from Tennessee and adjacent southern states.

Vanderbilt's Kirkland. Before 1900, Vanderbilt's second chancellor, James H. Kirkland, sought a Vanderbilt-Peabody affiliation similar to that of Teachers College at Columbia University, with Peabody Normal College moved from its three-mile distant University of Nashville location onto the Vanderbilt campus. Besides Peabody's financial assets as the PEF's promised legatee, Kirkland saw Peabody Normal College as part of Vanderbilt University, helping to make Nashville the leading university center of the South. Kirkland's two big battles were to make Vanderbilt independent of Methodist control, which occurred after a 1914 court case, and to merge Peabody with Vanderbilt, which occurred 40 years after his death.

Vanderbilt-Peabody Link Attempts. Kirkland's early plans for a Vanderbilt-Peabody connection included Daniel Coit Gilman, the Johns Hopkins University president. Gilman was then the South's most respected higher education leader and was also an influential PEF trustee. Kirkland in 1899 told his friend Gilman he hoped that when Gilman retired from the Johns Hopkins, he (Gilman) would become Peabody Normal College president and help form a Vanderbilt-Peabody affiliation. In a letter to Gilman in January 1900, Kirkland expressed the hope that a new Peabody College Board of Trustees would favor affiliation with Vanderbilt. Kirkland thought that merger would be advanced if Gilman spoke at Vanderbilt's twenty-fifth anniversary (1900) on the need for university development in the South. But Gilman could not accept the speaking invitation.

In January 1901, when Gilman was to retire as the Johns Hopkins president, Kirkland again urged Gilman to head Peabody Normal College and help make it a Vanderbilt University department. Both institutions would benefit, he reasoned, with Peabody becoming more influential in advancing the teaching profession in the South. Gilman approved Kirkland's plan but declined to head the new Peabody Normal College.

Having failed to get Peabody to affiliate with Vanderbilt (with Gilman as Peabody Normal College president), Kirkland wooed James D. Porter, Peabody Normal College president, a PEF trustee, and a former Tennessee governor during 1874-78. Porter wanted Peabody to remain in its south Nashville location. Anticipating the PEF's dissolution and its large final gift to Peabody Normal College, Porter secured legislation in 1903 transferring University of Nashville assets to Peabody Normal College. A PEF committee during 1903-05 planned the Fund's closing and transfer of its assets to assure Peabody Normal College as the leading teachers' institution in the South. Present at the January 1905 final vote transferring PEF assets to Peabody Normal College were such influential Peabody Fund trustees as Theodore Roosevelt and J.P. Morgan.

Peabody Moves Next to Vanderbilt. To induce Peabody to move nearby, Kirkland had Vanderbilt land deeded as a site for the new George Peabody College for Teachers. Porter still resisted Peabody Normal College's physical move. Holding the trump money card, the Peabody Fund trustees voted on October 5, 1909, to transform Peabody Normal College (1875-1909) into George Peabody College for Teachers (1909-79). For reasons of academic cooperation and mutual strength, the trustees decided on Peabody's physical move to Hillsboro Road, next to but not on Vanderbilt land.

Porter resigned as Peabody Normal College president August 4, 1909, and was compensated by a pension from the Carnegie Pension Fund. George Peabody College for Teachers maintained its independence and erected buildings during 1911-14 on its present Hillsboro location, across the road from but not on Vanderbilt land.

Peabody President B. R. Payne. Peabody's new president who supervised the move to Hillsboro Road was Bruce Ryburn Payne, president for 27 years during 1911-37. This North Carolina-born graduate of Trinity College (later Duke University) and Columbia University Teachers College had been professor at William and Mary College and the University of Virginia. Raising money for Peabody's new buildings, he modeled the new campus on Thomas Jefferson's architectural plan at the University of Virginia: a quadrangle of columned buildings (the "pillars of Peabody") and a green inner mall, dominated at the head of the campus by the Social-Religious Building with its prominent rotunda. George Peabody College for Teachers taught its first students on the new Hillsboro site in the summer session of 1914, with 1,108 students enrolled, 18 of them from Vanderbilt.

Payne-Kirkland Differences. Payne, like Kirkland, was a strong administrator with a vibrant personality. Their relationship, although formal and polite, was somewhat strained because Payne was determined to keep Peabody independent and yet cooperate with Vanderbilt in courses and students. Kirkland was disappointed at not having Peabody under Vanderbilt's tent and on its land. Payne's egalitarian concern for democratic education followed the democratic educational philosophy of his Columbia University mentor, John Dewey. Payne stood apart from Kirkland's classical elitism, staunch advocacy of law and order, and highly nuanced southern race and class distinctions. Payne raised $1.5 million to match the PEF final gift, temporarily making Peabody richer than Vanderbilt. Payne's plans for Peabody, however, were cut short with his death.

Through the years trivial irritations arose over differences in fees and the fact that Peabody had more women than men students. Peabody women students charged discrimination and a snobbish belittling of education courses by Vanderbilt liberal arts professors. (Vanderbilt faculty gladly taught for extra pay in Peabody's large summer school.) Still, there was a mutually beneficial exchange of students during the 1920s-50s, with more Peabodians taking Vanderbilt graduate courses than the other way round. Rightly or wrongly, Payne and the Peabody faculty sensed that Vanderbilt wanted to separate its graduate courses from them and that Vanderbilt's academic Dean Walter L. Fleming (dean during 1923-29) and subsequent deans and some Vanderbilt faculty disdained Peabody's teacher education mission and belittled its academic standards.

Vanderbilt's Education Department Experiment. In 1926 Dean Fleming proposed to Kirkland that Vanderbilt establish its own Education Department. After some hesitation, Kirkland established a Vanderbilt Education Department in 1930 (causing some apprehension at Peabody), headed by Joseph K. Hart. He had taught at the University of Chicago and the University of Wisconsin, favored John Dewey's ideas, and was an accomplished textbook writer (*A Social Interpretation of Education*, 1929). Hart's liberalism led to student disturbances and ended his four-year Vanderbilt career (1930-34) with some bitterness and vague threats of a lawsuit. Chancellor Kirkland's retirement and President Payne's death, both in 1937, ended some 27 years of occasionally contentious but generally mutually beneficial Peabody-Vanderbilt cooperation.

Joint University Libraries (JUL) Cooperation. Research library needs during the administrations of Vanderbilt Chancellor Oliver C. Carmichael and Peabody President S.C. Garrison (during 1937-45) led to the establishment of the Joint University Libraries (JUL), opened in 1941 to serve Vanderbilt, Peabody, and Scarritt College for Christian Workers (founded in 1892 under Methodist control). In studying the library needs of the three cooperating institutions in 1935, A. Frederick Kuhlman, associate director of the University of Chicago Libraries and an American Library Association representative, noted and soon had eliminated 280 quarter hours of duplicated courses among the institutions. The JUL, directed by Kuhlman, and the large foundation financial aid and cooperation its operation required, helped clarify Peabody's and Vanderbilt's distinct missions: Peabody's focus on education, fine arts, practical arts, and summer school, and Vanderbilt's focus on undergraduate and graduate liberal arts and sciences. The JUL dedication on December 5-6, 1941 (renamed in 1984 the Jean and Alexander Heard Library), further aided mutually beneficial Peabody-Vanderbilt cooperation.

A Joint MAT Program. During 1952-55 Vanderbilt's Chancellor Harvie Branscomb and Peabody's President Henry H. Hill (1945-61) cooperated in a joint two-year Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) program. Funded by the Ford Foundation, subject content courses were taught at Vanderbilt and education courses at Peabody. When Peabody declined to continue its part in the joint MAT program, Vanderbilt added to its own small teacher certification program a special Ph.D. program to improve college teaching, with professional courses taken at Peabody. When Vanderbilt added a full-time director of teacher education to supervise the certification of elementary teachers, Peabody again felt apprehensive. Vanderbilt's elementary school teachers took professional courses at Peabody, and Vanderbilt's secondary school teachers took student teaching and one teaching methods course at Peabody.

Nashville University Center Plan. A May 1962 study by educator John Dale Russell recommended a Nashville University Center, with a common school calendar, a foreign languages area, geographic studies area, performing arts, research and grants, a faculty club, a university press, intramural and intercollegiate sports, and music and drama clubs and presentations. The plan, open to other Nashville institutions, stopped short of a Peabody-Vanderbilt merger but mentioned raising Peabody faculty salaries and reducing Peabody teaching loads to the Vanderbilt levels. Vanderbilt never fully embraced the plan, which was nursed along through the 1970s by a 1969 Ford Foundation grant. Peabody officials thought the plan seemed too much Vanderbilt-centered.

In retrospect, the 1962 Russell Plan was Peabody's last chance to affiliate with Vanderbilt from a position of strength. Vanderbilt's enrollment and financial status grew in the 1960s; Peabody's finances went into slow decline. Cooperation continued in the JUL, in academic courses, and in athletics and other programs. Peabody and Vanderbilt were neighboring educational institu-

tions with mostly pleasant contacts and memories but with different histories and missions. Their faculty and student backgrounds, experiences, and attitudes were also different. Affluent Vanderbilt students, reflecting their parents' elitism and conservatism, were different from Peabody students' more prosaic, less cultured, egalitarian family backgrounds.

Economic Recession, 1970s. A national recession preceded Peabody-Vanderbilt merger, affecting higher education in the 1970s with rising energy and other costs and inflation. Enrollments declined, especially in colleges of education. Peabody lost 30 faculty members during 1970-72, found itself with unused facilities, and some of its Ph.D. programs faced loss of accreditation. By 1974, Peabody had reduced its programs in music and accounting; eliminated programs in business education, home economics, and modern languages; sold its Demonstration School; and cut its arts and science courses. Undergraduate enrollment dropped between 1972-76 from 1,200 to 800, and graduate enrollment shrunk to about 1,200. Stringent measures saved Peabody's plant and endowment, but these were now so threatened that a further weakened Peabody had little to offer in merger talks.

Peabody President Dunworth. Peabody's new president during 1974-79 was John Dunworth, a former dean of the School of Education at Ball State University, Muncie, IN. In August 1978 he persuaded Peabody trustees to begin unpublicized merger talks with Vanderbilt. He did not want to irritate already threatened Peabody faculty, students, and alumni. He preferred merger talks to reach resolution before Peabody interest groups organized resistance. Dunworth stood firm on a guaranteed survival of a strong Peabody College of Education. But he and others knew that Peabody professors outside the areas of education and human development would have to be let go. No longer an equal and somewhat of a supplicant, Dunworth held merger talks during September and December 1978 with Vanderbilt Chancellor Alexander Heard and Vanderbilt President Fields.

Early Merger Talks. To Vanderbilt officials in 1978, absorbing Peabody was less attractive than it had been during 1900-50. Still, Vanderbilt had a major stake in Peabody's survival. Vanderbilt needed Peabody's programs in education, physical education, accounting, music education, and some psychology areas. Vanderbilt needed to continue its cooperation with Peabody in Medical Center research, student counseling, student health, band, choir, joint athletic teams (Peabody athletes were essential to Vanderbilt's intercollegiate sports competition), equity in the Joint University libraries, and Vanderbilt also needed Peabody dormitory space for its students.

Vanderbilt's President Fields wanted Peabody's assets but not at the price of guaranteeing indefinite continuation of a full-fledged college of education. Fields' thoughts on merger included scaling Peabody down to something close to an educational policy study program or guaranteeing the existing college of education for eight years, after which Vanderbilt could convert Peabody to whatever purposes it wished. Merger costs would have to come from Peabody's endowment, Peabody's earnings would have to cover its own costs, and Peabody trustees would have to surrender Peabody's total assets.

Talk of Leaving Nashville. President Fields and Chancellor Heard told President Dunworth that merger talks would have to become public, with full disclosure of joint Vanderbilt-Peabody committee consultations and of deliberations of the two boards of trustees, faculties, and faculty senates. Faced with what seemed to him to be difficult terms, Dunworth interrupted negotiations with Vanderbilt in December 1978. A possible merger with a university outside Nashville was mentioned (Duke University, Durham, NC, and George Washington University, Washington, DC, were named). Not believing that Peabody trustees would consider a merger outside of Nashville, Vanderbilt's President Fields believed that a more compliant Peabody would soon renew its courtship.

Peabody-TSU Merger? A new factor then entered the picture. Under court order in 1977 the formerly largely Black Tennessee Agricultural and Industrial University in Nashville merged with the Nashville campus of the University of Tennessee, the latter mainly a night college for commuting students. The new Tennessee State University (TSU) had tried but failed to work out a doctoral program in education first with Memphis State University and then with George Peabody College for Teachers. In January 1979, TSU representatives joined some members of the Tennessee State Board of Regents (governing board of former state colleges) in talks on a possible Peabody-TSU merger. Nashvillians, who read the story in local newspapers on February 13, 1979, were surprised, believing that their long cooperation made a Vanderbilt-Peabody merger manifest destiny. Despite some racial concerns (the image of TSU was of a largely Black institution), a Peabody-TSU merger was more acceptable than having Peabody leave Nashville. A Peabody-TSU merger was also tolerable to those who wanted a lower cost (lower than Vanderbilt's high tuition cost) public university in Nashville. When the Tennessee State Board of Regents voted 11-1 for a Peabody-TSU connection on March 10, 1979, Vanderbilt trustees quickly reconsidered their position.

Vanderbilt-Peabody Merger Agreement. Peabody-TSU talks provoked decisive Peabody-Vanderbilt merger action. Vanderbilt leaders considered what a Peabody-TSU merger would mean: many Black students on the nearby Peabody campus and a state-owned Peabody having to give up its cooperative programs with a private Vanderbilt. A formal offer by Chancellor Heard and Trustee Board chairman Sam M. Fleming on March 17, 1979, was presented to the Peabody trustees on March 19. After six hours of debate, Vanderbilt's offer was accepted by the Peabody board. Vanderbilt agreed to allow a joint TSU-Peabody doctoral program in education. On April 27, 1979, Vanderbilt's and Peabody's trustees signed a "Memorandum of Understanding." George Peabody College for Teachers of Vanderbilt University (Vanderbilt's ninth school) became effective on July 1, 1979.

Merger Terms. Vanderbilt absorbed about $11 million of Peabody's endowment, retained over $9 million after merger expenses, and allotted $8.5 million of that $9 million for continued Peabody support. Peabody kept its responsibility in teacher education and teacher certification programs; kept its undergraduate degree programs in elementary education, early childhood education, and a master's program in library science; kept its Ed.D. program; offered the Ph.D. program through

Vanderbilt's Graduate School; and kept its prestigious John F. Kennedy Center for Research on Education and Human Development. Peabody gave up its liberal arts component and ended its undergraduate degrees in physical sciences, social sciences, and human development (except educational psychology); and gave up its master's degree programs in art education and music education. These program changes went smoothly. But for Peabody faculty whose jobs were lost it was a time of uncertainty and sadnees, if not bitterness.

Peabody Positions Lost. Some Peabody faculty, especially those who lost their positions in a scarce job market, vigorously protested merger, voted "no confidence" in President Dunworth, and staged a symbolic march on the Peabody administration building. Reducing faculty and staff positions was difficult. Each of the 40 staff employees let go received a parting bonus of five percent of annual wage for each year of service, or up to 75 percent of their annual pay. Many found jobs at Vanderbilt. Non-tenured faculty received one year's pay plus $2,000 for relocation. Tenured faculty could either teach for a final year or receive severance pay of one year's salary and also collect a bonus of two percent for each year of service and one percent for each remaining year until retirement. For a few near retirement, this amounted to paid leave plus a sizable bonus. Vanderbilt helped find new or temporary positions for those whose jobs were lost.

In letters to Vanderbilt's Chancellor Heard and Peabody's President Dunworth, the national American Association of University Professors (AAUP), on appeal from the Peabody faculty, stressed affected faculty rights. While the Tennessee branch of AAUP condemned dismissals, the national AAUP took no action. In a show of solidarity, a small Vanderbilt faculty group urged Vanderbilt to retain all tenured Peabody faculty. By August 24, 1979, all Peabody tenured faculty had signed waivers (some were still bitter and jobless). By 1980, five of those had not found jobs. Two untenured faculty filed grievances; one initiated legal action but settled out of court.

Most Peabody faculty and staff, dedicated to Peabody's mission and proud of its history, were saddened by the necessity of merger. Their cooperation, quiet dignity, and good grace marked merger as their finest hour.

President Dunworth resigned on May 1, 1979 (with undisclosed severance pay), a necessary casualty of merger. Peabody psychology Professor Hardy C. Wilcoxon as acting dean smoothed the transition until the appointment of the new dean, Willis D. Hawley, in October 1980.

Vanderbilt Gain. Vanderbilt got 58 more acres, 16 major buildings, needed dormitory and apartment space, a president's home, and 1,800 added to its enrollment (over 9,000). As a gesture of good will, Vanderbilt committed $700,000 per year for 10 years to Peabody's operating budget. Someone called the merger the biggest real estate deal in Nashville's history (Peabody campus property was valued at over $55 million). Peabody student tuition costs inevitably rose 10 percent.

Peabody College was bruised and hurt by the merger but survived (ten years after merger it was stronger academically than ever). Peabody might not have survived as a high-cost college of education, despite its reputation, in competition with lower cost and widely available public institutions. Peabody's own best graduates had become state university presidents, deans, leading teachers, researchers, and education writers. Peabody-trained educational leaders thus helped strengthen lower cost public university colleges of education which competed with Peabody, ironically contributing to Peabody's demise as an independent private teachers college.

Was Merger Necessary? Wise Peabodians and other educators of the late 1970s knew that the time was long past for the survival of a private independent single purpose teachers college like Peabody, despite its regional reputation and national influence. Most Peabodians from today's perspective see the 1979 merger as a necessary and positive step, leading in fact to more productive years for Peabody. But fairness requires mention of the belief that merger could have been avoided, that Peabody could have made it on its own. This is the theme of William Force's 1986 book, *A Short History of George Peabody College for Teachers, 1974-1979*. He was Vanderbilt's Vice Chancellor of Operations and Fiscal Management, 1966-70, and Peabody's Vice President, Director of Institutional Research, and Higher Education Professor, 1970-81.

Force Says No. Force felt that Peabody's independence of, yet nearness to and cooperation with Vanderbilt, along with years of open and covert merger talks, gave Peabody "a problem of identification that led to many in-house and external reevaluations of Peabody's mission, strengths, weaknesses, and needs. A prestigious three-member 1949 external committee found that two-thirds of Peabody's income came from its combined liberal arts and teacher education undergraduate school programs (enrolling over 1,200 from a 2,000 total enrollment). This finding justified the undergraduate school as Peabody's main financial support. Despite merger rumors and one prominent joint appointment with Vanderbilt (Nicholas Hobbs was a Peabody professor, 1951-70, with an overlap as Vanderbilt provost, 1967-75), Peabody trustees in 1969 affirmed Peabody's independence, stating that "cooperation with Vanderbilt was never meant and does not now mean any merger."

Peabody Difficulties. Following three years of deficits, 1968-70, President John Claunch appointed two new vice presidents, May 1970, to balance the budget, which was accomplished in 1972: expenditures, $9,715,034; income, $10,157,919. Knowing that President Claunch was near retirement and wanting to limit speculation about selecting a new president, the Peabody trustees in May 1972 used a "Long Range Planning Committee" as a smoke screen for a presidential search committee. It was announced on August 8, 1973, that President Claunch was retiring and that Peabody's new president on January 1, 1974, would be John Dunworth. The faculty was disappointed at not being involved in the president's selection, but cooperated and applauded President Dunworth's promise of substantial raises.

The path to Peabody-Vanderbilt merger began, wrote Force, when Dunworth replaced the two administrators who had carried out the 1970-74 financial belt tightening. Changing Peabody's Bylaws, Force also believed, limited trustee-faculty interaction; distanced the trustees from faculty, staff, and student opinion; narrowed trustees' view of Peabody affairs; and adversely affected campus morale.

***Design* Recommendations.** Peabody's collapse or

merger became inevitable, Force wrote, by the loss of undergraduate enrollment (and attendant financial support), which he attributed to the trustees' implementation of a 1974 report, *Design for the Future: A Report from the Select Committee on Peabody's Second Century to President John Dunworth and the Board of Trustees. Design* was written by three-members during the spring and summer of 1974, with too little faculty discussion, thought Force (with ample interaction, recalled the authors). The authors recall that President Dunworth was unwilling for the report to be reviewed or revised by any interest group before the trustees considered it. On August 29, 1974, the trustees approved the report by voice vote with one dissent. Force saw this affirmative trustee vote as a noncritical vote of confidence in the new president, and not how well they understood the report's full implications.

One of *Design*'s 107 recommendations called for the elimination of vice presidencies for academic and administrative affairs and their replacement by four key administrative officers reporting to the president. The academic vice president took sabbatical leave followed by retirement before *Design*'s approval by the trustees. Vice President for Administrative Affairs William Force's title was retired by trustee approval of *Design*, with his responsibilities reorganized in a new office of Executive Dean for Administrative Affairs.

Non Teaching Degree Programs Eliminated. Peabody's difficulties and forced merger, Force believed, came from implementing two recommendations in *Design*: eliminating non teaching degrees: Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Music, Master of Arts, and Doctor of Musical Arts; and requiring a "professional" or methods component in all courses. This recommendation, Force wrote, reduced academic content time when the national trend was to strengthen academic courses. Implementing *Design*, Force believed, caused 36 faculty members either to leave for other jobs or be dismissed. Before the July 1, 1979, merger, another 38 full-time and three part-time faculty left or were let go, 23 of them with tenure. The Art Department, without its Bachelor of Arts degree, Force wrote, was unable to attract qualified students and closed at the end of 1976. Force attributed the undergraduate enrollment decline (from 850 to 649 during 1976-79) to implementation of *Design* and failure to publish a 1975-76 catalogue. He also attributed to *Design* the spending of $600,000 for each of three years from Peabody College's endowment and the loss of income from that total of $1.8 million.

Force's Interpretation Challenged. Critics of Force's interpretation defend the *Design*'s three authors as dedicated lifetime career Peabody faculty whose recommendations were in Peabody's best interest. They cite the following errors in Force's interpretation of events: Under the *Design*, all academic programs (not courses) were to have a professional education orientation. Existing Doctor of Philosophy degree programs and new ones in education-related fields were encouraged. Trustees' approval of $600,000 per year withdrawal from Peabody's endowment for program development preceded *Design* and was not a consequence of its adoption. The Art Department was not terminated in 1976 but continued until it was eliminated as one of Vanderbilt's preconditions for merger. It was Vanderbilt's precondition for merger, not the *Design*, which led to the loss of 38 faculty positions in 1979, including the 23 tenured professors. Reduction in undergraduate enrollment cited by Force was predicted in *Design*. But (not mentioned by Force) this undergraduate reduction was offset by a much greater increase in the number of graduate students and graduate student credit hours in the kinds of campus professional programs called for in the *Design*.

Why Vanderbilt Acquiesced. At the merger signing, April 27, 1979, Vanderbilt Chancellor Heard painted the bigger picture of advantages to both institutions in merger. He said (in effect): after seven decades of cooperation Vanderbilt and Peabody need each other. Vanderbilt is in the business of higher education and the precollege schooling of its entering students needs improvement. We live in a knowledge-based and science-and-technology-determined society and world. Because Peabody College has the expertise to prepare better teachers, who in turn prepare better entering students, Vanderbilt needs Peabody. And Peabody needs Vanderbilt's strong university base. The risk we take in working together is worth taking because of the success we can achieve together.

Sharpening Peabody's Focus. Acting Dean Hardy C. Wilcoxon, under whom Peabody College began its first year and a half as Vanderbilt's ninth school, 1979-80, pointed to Peabody's need to "sharpen its focus as a professional school." A Peabody faculty member since 1966, Wilcoxon had degrees from the University of Arkansas (B.A., 1947, and M.A., 1948) and Yale University (Ph. D., 1951). He and others knew that Peabody, like all Vanderbilt schools, had to pay its own way from its students' tuition, research grants, and fundraising, as well as pay for university plant operation and personnel, and other services.

Peabody's Dean Hawley. Willis D. Hawley, named Peabody College dean October 15, 1980, came to Vanderbilt in August 1980 to teach political science and to direct the Center for Education and Human Development at Vanderbilt's interdisciplinary Institute for Public Policy. A San Francisco native, he earned the B.A., M.A., and Ph. D. degrees in political science from the University of California, Berkeley, where he also earned his teaching credentials. At Yale University, 1969-72, he taught political science and also co-directed Yale's training of secondary school teachers. He taught political science at Duke University, 1972-80, where he was also director of its Center for Education Policy. During 1977-78 he was on leave from Duke to help plan the cabinet-level U.S. Department of Education under President Jimmy Carter.

Hawley had a clear view of U.S. education needs and school reform demands which blossomed in the 1980s (*Nation at Risk*, 1983, and others). He and the faculty began to sharpen Peabody's professional focus and educational priorities. By the 1983-84 school year Peabody College had upgraded its undergraduate and graduate programs, added new faculty, acquainted them with the new educational technology (Ed Tech; i.e., computers and telecommunications applied to learning), and moved the college into national leadership in using Ed Tech to improve public school learning. Hawley put Peabody's scattered Ed Tech components under a Learning Technology Center to enhance research, secure grant projects, and apply findings to improve public schools.

Hawley wrote in 1986 that "Peabody, more than any other school of education and human development, [is]

national in scope and influence." He cited Peabody as "America's School of Education" because "we are arguably better than anyone else at linking knowledge to practice." After a 1987 self study on Peabody's mission, Hawley wrote that "Peabody's central mission is to enhance the social and cognitive development of children and youth," focusing on the handicapped, and to transfer that knowledge into action through policy analysis, product development, and the design of practical models.

Library School Closed. Besides program revision, the 1987 self-study led Peabody to close its 60-year-old Department of Library and Information Science. Hawley explained that the library school had been understaffed, that enrollment had not grown, that the school librarian's task was evolving into a computer-based facilitator of learning, and that to meet American Library Association would mean adding faculty. A two-day celebration in May 1987 honored Peabody's Library School leaders and alumni.

Ten Years Since Merger. Stepping down as dean in 1989, Hawley reflected on Peabody's ten years as Vanderbilt's ninth school. There was anxiety then and optimism now, he said. To make Peabody the best U.S. school of education and human development, he added, we improved two-thirds of the programs, collaborated with Fisk University on increasing the numbers of minority teachers, added new faculty, and increased Peabody's capacity to serve and influence educational policymakers and practitioners. We established the Center for Advanced Study of Educational Leadership, the Corporate Learning Center, the Learning Technology Center, and strengthened and broadened the mission of the John F. Kennedy Center for Research on Education and Human Development. We increased student aid and have seen external research and development funding grow at an annual rate of 20 percent. In education technology research and learning, he said, "we can claim to be the best in the country."

Progress Since Merger. After a leave of absence and return to other Vanderbilt duties, Hawley became education dean at the University of Maryland on July 1, 1993. Some key achievements at Peabody through the 1980s decade under Hawley's deanship follow:

Educational Leadership: The U.S. Department of Education awarded (1989) Peabody College and Harvard University a joint 5-year $2.5 million grant to study effective leadership in K-12 (kindergarten through grade 12) school systems. The grant funded a National Center for Educational Leadership, housed at both Peabody and at Harvard to study the leadership styles of school principals and school superintendents.

Middle School Ed Tech: Apple Computer donated (also in 1989) ten computers, with equipment and software matched by Peabody College, to improve math, science, and language arts teaching in a Nashville middle school. Besides better middle school learning, multimedia presentations showed prospective teachers how to apply Ed Tech in the classroom. Peabody College is one of a six-member Southeast research university consortium testing and evaluating new Ed Tech programs in teaching and learning.

Ed Tech and Handicapped Children: Peabody College received (again, in 1989) a four-year $80,000 grant for 20 educators to develop and evaluate computer-based instruction to improve learning by children with disabilities. The 20 teachers so trained, in turn, were resource educators for other teacher education institutions, thus stimulating ongoing programs. "We're on the forefront of computer-based instruction," Peabody's special education professor in charge of the research said, "and one of the leading institutions on technology as applied to teaching children with disabilities."

Learning Math with Jasper: Peabody's Learning Technology Center developed (since 1987-88) a multimedia videodisk series of "Jasper" stories for middle school math learning. In the first 15-minute story, middle school student Jasper Woodbury buys a motorboat and must figure out whether or not he can take the boat home by sunset without running out of fuel. Using facts in the story, middle school students apply practical mathematics to solve the problem. The story also has "hooks" that introduce related subjects, as when Jasper buys the boat and the question of fuel source arises. A discussion about geography and natural resources follows. Children using Jasper stories were found to be better able to solve complex math problems than were children solving similar word-described-problems. Math is made more interesting to teach and to learn, along with related subjects. The Jasper video story project soon involved eleven schools in nine states.

Best Counselor & Guidance Program. For three consecutive years, Peabody College was named as having the "top choice" program to prepare guidance counselors. The judges (618 high school guidance counselors) most often named Peabody College as having the best program for undergraduates from among 650 quality four-year colleges, public and independent, listed in *Rugg's Recommendations on the Colleges* for 1990, 1991, and 1992

Peabody's Dean Pellegrino. Peabody's new dean, James Pellegrino (since January 1, 1992), was acting dean at the University of California, Santa Barbara, before joining Vanderbilt as holder of the Frank M. Mayborn Chair of Cognitive Studies. To keep Peabody on the cutting edge of educational research, he said, more research space was needed, along with continued cooperative Ed Tech research, such as the Jasper video story project. "I inherited a financially stable and intellectually robust institution," he said in the fall of 1992 (enrollment was over 1,500 [870 undergraduate, some 630 graduate students]). His goals were to so undergird Peabody's instructional programs with innovative technology that they will be "uniquely superior" and set a standard for other universities.

Peabody, Dean Pellegrino said, was developing a college-wide blueprint to improve learning in American schools. That blueprint included continued collaboration with school leaders and teachers in Nashville and elsewhere, focusing on Peabody College-developed innovative educational technology. Besides Peabody's September 1992 collaboration with Nashville schools (one of Peabody's 35 projects with Nashville schools), Peabody also joined the U.S. Education Department-sponsored alliance to promote the six national education goals.

S-R Building: Tech Ed and Administration Center. During 1993-95 Peabody renovated and expanded by 50,000 feet its historic Social-Religious Building at a cost of $14.5 million to make it the center for Ed Tech research and development. The focus is on developing the creative use in education of computers, interactive

video and audio, fiber optics, and satellite systems. The Social-Religious Building, retaining the main auditorium, also houses Peabody College central administrative offices, the Department of Teaching and Learning, and the Learning Technology Center. It has capabilities for multimedia presentations, productions, and conference facilities, and also have a visitor's center.

Thus, since 1979, under deans Hawley and Pellegrino, Peabody College has advanced its small but excellent teacher education and other programs, especially Ed Tech; has been financially stable, has refurbished its physical plant, and has continued to enhance its national reputation. Peabody's catalogue states that among its 29,000 living alumni are more than 30 presidents of colleges and universities, superintendents in 175 school systems, and well prepared teachers in many U.S. and overseas classrooms. Since 1867, the PEF began and Peabody College continues to serve education and human development in the South and the nation.

Peabody Institute of Baltimore

George Peabody in Baltimore. Baltimore was George Peabody's commercial base and residence during 1815-37, or for 22 of his 74 years. After he established his first Peabody Institute (library and lecture hall and fund) in his hometown of Danvers, MA (renamed Peabody, MA, 1868) in 1852, he asked Baltimore friends visiting London to help him to establish a Peabody Institute for Baltimore. His total gift of $1.4 million made possible the Peabody Institute of Baltimore. His February 12, 1857, founding letter was drafted by trustee and friend John Pendleton Kennedy, a many talented novelist, statesman, and U.S. Navy Secretary (Samuel F.B. Morse demonstrated his telegraph and Commodore Matthew Perry opened trade with Japan under Navy Secretary Kennedy). Kennedy shaped Peabody's philanthropic intent into a four-part research and reference library, art gallery, academy (later conservatory) of music, and scholarly lecture series.

Baltimore in 1857. When the Peabody Institute was founded in 1857, Baltimore, with over 200,000 population, was a thriving port city and a commercial, industrial, and shipbuilding center. Baltimore did have a little used Mercantile Library and a struggling member-only Library Company of Maryland founded in 1797 (which the Maryland Historical Society trustees sponsored; some of its books were later transferred to the Peabody Institute Library of Baltimore). But, compared with culturally superior New York City, Boston, and Philadelphia, Baltimoreans thought of their city as a cultural wasteland, the only major U.S. city without a noteworthy university, art gallery, music school, or public library. To meet Baltimore's cultural need, to repay Baltimore for his 22 years of commercial success there, and in line with his 1852 sentiment accompanying his first check for his first institute, "Education—a debt due from present to future generations," Peabody founded and Kennedy and other trustees shaped the four-part Peabody Institute of Baltimore. The Peabody Institute, opened October 25, 1866, in fashionable Mount Vernon Place, near the Washington Monument (built by Robert Mills, who later designed the Washington Monument in the District of Columbia), was an early cultural center, similar to the later New York City's Lincoln Center and Washington, DC's Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. The Peabody Institute building was designed in a grand new Renaissance style by Edmund G. Lind, a young British-born architect practicing in Baltimore.

First Librarian J. G. Morris. Local Lutheran minister John G. Morris was the first Peabody Institute director and librarian during 1860-67. A later scholar in several fields, he was pastor of Baltimore's First English Lutheran Church, 1827-60. His 1896 *Life and Reminiscences of an Old Lutheran Minister* recalled that George Peabody had listed him with others for a vacancy among the trustees. He was elected a trustee in 1858. In 1860 the Institute was inactive, the building not finished, no books had been bought, but the trustees wanted a librarian. He was chosen June 1, 1860, from four candidates and began work August 1, 1860. He corresponded with European and American book dealers, went to Boston and New York to purchase books and to study libraries and their management, and compiled a first want list of 50,000 books, printed in 1861, and a second want list, printed in 1863. While the Civil War delayed construction of the Peabody Institute building, Morris, aided by library committees, located and bought over 50,000 of the world's best reference and research books, overflowing the Peabody Institute Library's original quarters. When his contracted period ended in 1867, he became pastor of Baltimore's Third Lutheran Church and spoke and wrote on religious and scientific subjects.

Peabody Institute Provost N. H. Morison. Nathaniel Holmes Morison was the Peabody Institute's first provost (and second librarian, succeeding J. G. Morris) during 1867-90, or for 23 years. Morison was born in Petersborough, NH, and worked his way through both Phillips Academy, Exeter, MA, and Harvard College (1839). He came to Baltimore to teach at a private day school for girls (1839-41), established his own Morison School for Girls in Baltimore (1841-67), and from that position became Peabody Institute provost.

Provost Morison's descendant, Harvard historian Samuel Eliot Morison (wrote *Admiral of the Ocean Sea*, 1942, about Christopher Columbus), gave the 1957 Peabody Institute of Baltimore centennial address. He described Provost Morison as Baltimore's outstanding intellectual until around 1880 when the Johns Hopkins University and its President Daniel C. Gilman began to overshadow the Peabody Institute and its Provost N. H. Morison.

Peabody Institute Lectures. Before Provost Morison's appointment in 1867, the Peabody Lecture Series began with a talk in 1866 by Joseph Henry of the Smithsonian Institution. Provost Morison scoured the U.S. and England for outstanding lecturers in the arts, sciences, and literature, often introducing them himself. James Russell Lowell lectured in 1871-72 on Edmund Spenser and John Milton. Ralph Waldo Emerson lectured in 1872, with poet Walt Whitman and naturalist John Burroughs in the audience. Noting poor attendance at similar Institute lectures in other cities when there was no entry fee, Provost Morison made a modest charge which helped improve lecture attendance in Baltimore. Lectures were suspended during 1899-1906 because of lessened public demand, restored in 1907 when U.S. Naval Commander Robert Edwin Peary's spoke on his North Pole explorations, discontinued during 1915-69, and revived in 1969 under Peabody Institute President (and Conservatory Director) Richard Franko Goldman.

Librarian P. R. Uhler. Philip Reese Uhler, first

employed by librarian J. G. Morris and Morison's assistant librarian, succeeded Morison as the Peabody's third librarian during 1890-1913, or for 13 years. He was an entomologist who had worked with Harvard University scientist Louis Agassiz. A critical need for space in 1875 led to a spectacular new library building, also designed by Edmund G. Lind, and built on the east side of the original structure. The new building, opened on September 30, 1878, was so expertly joined to the old that the two appear as one structure.

Impressive Library Building. Visitors and scholarly users from around the world are struck by the six tiers of book stacks which soar 56 feet to a skylit ceiling The book stacks are supported by pillars and cast iron gilt-covered railings. The impressive interior of five decorated balconies of books framing the large oblong interior reading room with study desks has been called a "Cathedral of Books." Architects, scholars, and general visitors are still struck by the library's architecture, unique collection, and extensive book catalogues. Library school students and others came to inspect the collection, observe library operations, and view the spectacular interior. They came from New York State Library, Columbia University Library School, Drexel Institute (Philadelphia) Library School and elsewhere. Chicago's Newberry Library is said to be modeled in part on the Peabody Library of Baltimore. The Johns Hopkins art historian Phoebe B. Stanton believed architect Lind modeled the exterior and interior after London gentlemen's clubs, such as the Reform Club, for scholarly contemplation amid classical grandeur. The Peabody Library building, interior, and unique collection remain one of America's most noted and written about research and reference libraries.

Historian S. E. Morison's 1957 centennial address praised his ancestor Provost N. H. Morison's valuable book purchases that helped make the Peabody Library unique. At the turn of the century its collection was exceeded in quality only by the Harvard Library and the Library of Congress. For some years the Peabody Library holdings in ancient history and literature surpassed even those of the Library of Congress. With pride, Peabody librarians filled interlibrary loan requests from the Library of Congress.

Peabody Library Book Catalogues. Book catalogues were used before card catalogues. Using the book catalogues of the New York Astor Library and the British Museum Library as models, Morison, Uhler, and some assistants spent 14 years (1869-1882) completing the first five-volume *Catalogue of the Library of the Peabody Institute of the City of Baltimore*, 1883-93, listing some 100,000 volumes by author, title, and with many cross referenced content articles. A second catalogue of eight volumes listing additional books appeared in 1905.

Provost Morison justified the value and uniqueness of the research and reference library as follows in an annual report:

> Education always proceeds from the above downward, from the best to the common minds, from the leaders of the people to the people themselves. Furnish...the foundations of intelligence and thought, and they will...stimulate and improve the whole community.

Influence on Enoch Pratt Free Library. Yet, Morison also cared about mass public reading needs. He had an ally in Baltimore merchant Enoch Pratt, a Peabody Institute trustee and treasurer, intimately involved in day by day Peabody Library activities. Aware of the need and encouraged by Morison, he endowed the Enoch Pratt Free [public] Library. Morison helped him design the building and select the books. Baltimoreans eagerly welcomed the Enoch Pratt Free Library's opening in 1886, located near the Peabody Institute. By then the Johns Hopkins University had been open for ten years (opened in 1876). The Peabody Library was destined to be part of the Enoch Pratt Free Library during 1966-82. The Peabody Conservatory of Music and the Peabody Library became part of the Johns Hopkins University from 1982.

Peabody Conservatory of Music. The Peabody Conservatory of Music (Academy to 1874) was the first founded in the U.S (1857) but the fourth to offer instruction (1868), after the Conservatory at Oberlin College, Ohio, in 1865; and the Conservatory of New England (Boston), and the Cincinnati Conservatory, both in 1867. European music conservatories emphasized superior virtuoso performance, had church origins, and received state support. Private U.S. music conservatories had to meet mass musical tastes and needs to attract financial support. For accreditation, they had to add their own liberal arts courses or affiliate with a liberal arts college or university. The Peabody Conservatory of Music went through these stages in adapting to changing American needs.

The opening of the Peabody Academy of Music was delayed first by the financial panic of 1859, the year the Peabody Institute building foundation was laid at Mount Vernon Place; delayed by the Civil War after the two-story building was completed in September 1861; and further delayed after the Peabody Institute dedication on October 25, 1866, when George Peabody smoothed jurisdiction conflict between the Maryland Historical Society and the Peabody trustees.

The Library on the second floor opened in 1860. Lectures began in 1866 with a talk by Joseph Henry of the Smithsonian Institution. Provost N. H. Morison was appointed on April 4, 1867. To start the Academy of Music, the trustees turned to Marylander James Monroe Deems, former University of Virginia professor, 1849-58; a Civil War hero and general; and a European-trained musician. He organized 12 concerts in 1866 and 11 in 1867 and hired local musicians, performers, and soloists plus Boston musician Lucien H. Southard. Southard gave three lectures on the history of music in February 1867. After a long search, the trustees appointed Southard as the Peabody Academy of Music director, during 1867-71, or for four years, at the Academy's first quarters at 34 Mulberry Street. Musical instruction began in October 1868.

Southard had studied music at Lowell Mason's Boston Academy and Trinity College, CT. He had been a composer and organist in Boston, Richmond, and Hartford before his Baltimore appointment. He started the Peabody Academy concerts and the Peabody Chorus singers. His short four-year tenure was attributed to alleged criticism by musical community cliques who disliked his northern background and criticized his inability to win community support. His importance in the Peabody Academy of Music's first years was overshad-

owed by the long tenure and accomplishments of his Copenhagen-born successor, Asger Hamerik. Peabody Institute records number music directors from Hamerik's time.

Conservatory Director A. Hamerik. Hamerik's appointment came after Peabody trustee Charles J. M. Eaton asked the help of American consul Fehrman in Vienna, Austria. Consul Fehrman's advertisement in a European music journal brought letters of interest from Hamerik and others. Despite unease about Hamerik's limited English and shyness, he was appointed as the Peabody Academy of Music's first director from July 11, 1871, until 1898, or for 27 years. He came from a musical family on his mother's side and had studied and performed under various music masters in London and Berlin (1862-64), Paris (1864, where he was French composer Hector Berlioz's only pupil), Stockholm, Milan, and Vienna.

Hamerik won Baltimore citizens' respect and support by his musical professionalism, persistence, zeal, and by playing American composers' works on concert programs. He overcame parents' reluctance for their children to study music as a profession. He raised the admission requirements, reorganized the curriculum, specified graduation requirements, purchased instrumental equipment, strengthened the music library, and added European-trained faculty. He revived the Peabody Chorus and established a student orchestra. Baltimoreans, feeling keenly their second class status to New York City's musical culture, valued the musical prestige Hamerik brought them.

Sidney Lanier. In 1873 Hamerik hired poet-musician Sidney Lanier as first flutist in the Peabody Symphony Orchestra. Lanier, then a 31-year-old law clerk, had left Macon, GA, to seek a music career in New York City. He stopped in Baltimore to visit his flutist friend Henry Wysham, through whom he met Asger Hamerik. Impressed when Lanier played his own flute compositions, Hamerik hired Lanier as first flutist. Better remembered as a fine Southern poet, Lanier lived in Baltimore near the Peabody Institute for eight years, lectured in English literature at the Johns Hopkins University (1879), and died in 1881 at age 39 of tuberculosis contracted when he was a Civil War prisoner.

In 1874 the Peabody Institute building was enlarged to include the site occupied by the Academy of Music; a third floor was added, and the name was changed to the Peabody Conservatory of Music. Also, during Hamerik's tenure, Robert Garrett (John Work Garrett's son) commissioned sculptor W.W. Story to duplicate his bronze seated George Peabody statue in Threadneedle Street, near the London stock exchange. The replica was placed in front of the Peabody Institute of Baltimore.

On February 22, 1876, under Provost Morison, with Hamerik conducting the Peabody Orchestra, the Peabody Institute hosted in its first music building Daniel C. Gilman's inauguration as first president of the Johns Hopkins University.

George Peabody and Johns Hopkins. When Baltimore merchant Johns Hopkins made known his intent to establish a philanthropic gift, Baltimore and Ohio Railroad president John Work Garrett brought Johns Hopkins and George Peabody together in his (Garrett's) home during George Peabody's 1866-67 U.S. visit. Hopkins asked Peabody how and why he began his philanthropy. Within 48 hours of that meeting, Johns Hopkins drafted his will establishing the university, medical school, and hospital. Both the Peabody Institute and the Johns Hopkins University were conceived as distinctive cultural institutions, the Peabody Institute as a unique cultural center; and the Johns Hopkins University, 18 years later, as the first U.S. graduate university organized like German universities to discover new knowledge by library and laboratory research, the results to be disseminated in seminars and publications.

The Johns Hopkins University was deliberately sited four blocks from the Peabody Institute so that faculty and students could use the Peabody Library's rich resources. Good relations continued after the Johns Hopkins University moved in 1916 three miles north to its Homewood campus. University library materials, particularly serial publications, deliberately complement rather than duplicate the Peabody Library collection to this day. The Johns Hopkins scholars long used the relatively close Peabody Library rather than the more distant Library of Congress, knowing that for years and in some fields the Peabody Library collections were superior. Well known researchers and the books they wrote using Peabody Library works include Johns Hopkins University historian Herbert Baxter Adams, a founder of modern U.S. historiography, and his students; poet Sidney Lanier; Baltimore *Sun* journalist H. L. Mencken (*The American Language*, 1919); Democratic presidential candidate William Jennings Bryan; Professor (later President) Woodrow Wilson (*Congressional Government*, 1901); and novelist John Dos Passos (*Three Men Who Made the Nation*, 1957).

Hamerik organized an Alumni Association, which sponsored a piano scholarship. He enhanced the Peabody Conservatory's prestige by attracting such eminent world musicians to visit and perform as Russian-born composer Anton Rubinstein; German-born pianist, conductor, and educator Hans von Bülow during December-January 1875-1876; British popular composer Arthur Sullivan of Gilbert and Sullivan fame in late December 1879; and Russian composer Peter Illytch Tschaikowsky in spring, 1891. Hamerik's former teacher, Hans von Bülow, wrote in a London paper that "Baltimore was the only place in America where I had proper support."

To avoid interruption, Hamerik worked in a difficult-to-reach windowless and gas-lit room atop a winding metal stairway. A bachelor when he came to Baltimore, he married one of his students from Tennessee. They had four children. In 1890 Hamerik received a knighthood from the king of Denmark. Having often said that an American should direct the Conservatory of Music, Hamerik retired after 27 years. With his leaving, the Peabody Conservatory of Music had completed 30 years of service to Baltimore (1868-98).

Conservatory Director Harold Randolph. The trustees chose Harold Randolph as second Conservatory of Music director during 1898-1927, or for 29 years. He had his entire musical training at the Peabody and was a faculty member when appointed. In his first year (1898) Randolph persuaded the trustees to make May Garrettson Evans' Preparatory School part of the Peabody Conservatory. Baltimore-born Evans spent her childhood in Georgetown, DC. She returned to Baltimore at age 13 to attend the Misses Hall's School. While she attended the Peabody Conservatory of Music her brother, a *Sun* reporter, occasionally asked her to review musical pro-

grams. This experience led her to become the *Sun*'s first woman reporter (between ages 20-27), covering dramatic, musical, and general events.

Preparatory Department. Mary Garrettson Evans saw that a preparatory music school for talented children would be a feeder to the Peabody Conservatory of Music and also serve as a general music school for adults. She suggested such a school to then director Asger Hamerik, who recommended it to the trustees, but no action was taken. In October 1894 at age 28 she started a preparatory school herself, helped by her sister Marian and taught mostly by Conservatory of Music students and staff. The school flourished, was first called the Peabody Graduates Preparatory and High School of Music, and four years later (1898) it became the Conservatory's Preparatory Department (called familiarly "the Prep"). Evans was superintendent of the Preparatory Department for over 30 years. She saw its enrollment grow from some 300 students to over 3,200 students in branches around Baltimore. Besides being a music school for talented children, the Preparatory Department reached into the community to serve public schools and adults interested in music, dance, and dramatic speech. It was also a laboratory school for Conservatory students pursuing the teacher's certificate. Before Evans retired in 1930, a gift from James Wilson Leakin enabled the Preparatory Department to move into its own modern music building, Leakin Hall (1927).

Harold Randolph introduced formal training programs to prepare music teachers and music supervisors, using Baltimore city schools for student teaching. He broadened the educational program, introduced private lessons in place of class lessons, and further Americanized European elements of the Conservatory. He introduced a Research Department, the first in a private music school; worked with the Johns Hopkins University to introduce music courses in the first summer session in 1912; and began a Concert Bureau during 1910-14, enabling Peabody Conservatory faculty artists to perform in nearby communities. To perform in Peabody's famed Friday Afternoon Recitals, Randolph invited such famed musicians as Fritz Kreisler, Pablo Casals, and Wanda Landowska. He started a Placement Bureau in 1914 to place Peabody-trained musicians in school and college positions. A joint Peabody-Johns Hopkins University Bachelor of Music program was begun in 1916. Student enrollment rose from 296 students in 1898 to 765 when Randolph died on July 6, 1927.

John Parker was the fourth Peabody librarian during 1913-27, or for 14 years; followed by Louis H. Dielman, the fifth Peabody librarian during 1926-42, or for 16 years. Well-known because of his long career as librarian and historian, Dielman was born in New Windsor, MD, then famous for its mineral springs, where his father managed the local Dielman Inn. Dielman was card cataloguer for the Maryland State Library, 1900-04; assistant librarian at the Enoch Pratt Free Library, 1904-11; and became a Peabody librarian in 1911. After leaving the Peabody Library, Dielman was on the staff of the Maryland Historical Society, was the second editor of the *Maryland Historical Magazine*, 1910-38, and compiled biographical reference cards on some 100,000 prominent Marylanders for the Maryland Historical Society. He retired to New Windsor, a much admired local historian whom the townspeople familiarly called "Mr. Lou."

Peabody Art Gallery. Although the Maryland Historical Society sponsored fine art exhibits during 1846-1909, the Peabody Institute Gallery of Art is said to have been Baltimore's first and the U.S.'s third art gallery. It began in 1873, when trustee John M. McCoy donated *Clytie*, a life-size marble statue of a woman sculptured in classical Greco-Roman style by Maryland sculptor William Henry Rinehart. Delighted, Provost Nathaniel Morison exhibited *Clytie* with two other marble figures, *Venus of the Shell* (marble copy of the Vatican's crouching Venus) and Joseph Mozor's *Pocahontas*, the last presented by trustee George S. Brown. These three works drew between 20 and 100 visitors a day. During March 4-April 5, 1879, the art gallery held a loan exhibition of paintings and sculpture, with average attendance of 280 by day and 246 by evening.

An exhibition in 1881 of casts of antiques, bas-relief, and statuary, which trustee John Work Garrett bought for the Peabody Gallery in London and Paris, also included a half-size bronze copy made by Ferdinand Barbedienne of the Ghiberti gates in the Baptistry of St. John in Florence. The catalogue of this popular exhibition went into three printings. Besides being Baltimore's first art museum, the Peabody Gallery of Art was something of an art school, since art students could by permission copy its works.

In 1884, while his private gallery was being prepared, John Work Garrett lent the Peabody Gallery 52 paintings he owned for a showing that attracted 13,464 visitors. In 1885, T. Harrison Garrett exhibited his collection of Rembrandt's etchings at the Peabody Gallery. In 1893 the Peabody Gallery received trustee Charles James Madison Eaton's art collection of 81 paintings, 62 watercolors, drawings, portrait miniatures, porcelain, and bronzes by Christophe Fratin. Eaton's nieces also presented to the Peabody Gallery the considerable art collection of Baltimore merchant Robert Gilmore, Jr., which their uncle had purchased to prevent its sale to buyers outside of Baltimore. In 1908, trustee John W. McCoy (whose gift of *Clytie* in 1873 started the Peabody Gallery of Art) gave the Peabody Gallery his art collection, which included other sculpture by Maryland sculptor William Henry Rinehart, along with paintings by Thomas Hovenden and Hugh Bolton Jones. In 1911, the Peabody Gallery received the art collection of Baltimore stock broker George Carter Irwin, which included works by Scacciati, Casmicache, Sirani, Volkmar, and Bonheur. Irwin's sisters established an Irwin Fund used by the Peabody Gallery to purchase paintings by such distinguished American artists as Winslow Homer, George Innes, Childe Hassam, and Jonas Lie.

The Peabody Gallery was especially active during 1911-12 when Sunday afternoon open hours were introduced. *Sun* writer H. L. Mencken wrote humorously of the sacrilege of Sunday viewing. There was a special "Exhibits of Contemporary American Art" in 1911, by the Charcoal Club of Baltimore for prospective buyers, with an illustrated catalogue listing 105 participating artists' names and addresses. Over 4,000 visitors came to see such works as Charles W. Hawthorne's *Fisher Boys*, George Bellows' *The Palisades*, Jonas Lie's *Harbor in Winter*, and Hassam's *The Ledges*. The successful exhibit became an annual event for some years.

The first one-man exhibit in 1912 featured Baltimore artist Charles H. Walther. In 1914 a modernist exhibit of Cubism and Futurism paintings caused some-

thing of a sensation. In 1916 there was a special exhibit of sculpture by Paul Manship. Baltimore women artists calling themselves "The Six" held frequent exhibits between 1912 and 1922.

In the mid 1930s the expanding Peabody Conservatory of Music's need for space prompted a decision to close the Peabody Gallery. Its over 1,000 art pieces were placed on extended loan in the Baltimore Museum of Art (opened 1914) and Baltimore's Walters Art Gallery (which became public in 1934).

Conservatory Director O. R. Ortmann. Otto Randolph Ortmann was the third Conservatory of Music director during 1928-41, or for 13 years. As with Harold Randolph, Ortmann was a Peabody Conservatory of Music graduate and a faculty member since 1917. Ortmann, from a musical Baltimore family of German background, studied at both the Johns Hopkins University and the Peabody Conservatory of Music, receiving the Conservatory's Teacher's Certificate in Piano in 1913 and the Peabody Artist Diploma (Composition) in 1917. While still a Peabody Conservatory student, he taught piano and harmony in the Peabody Prep (1911), was appointed acting director for a few months and then conservatory director in 1928 at age 39, continuing Randolph's programs. The 1930s economic depression, which necessitated fundraising, took time from Ortmann's administration, teaching, and music research. His fund drives during 1936-40, with Carnegie Corporation contributions, brought in over $120,000.

Fundraising cut into Ortmann's considerable research skills on such scientific aspects of music as acoustical phenomena, physics of sound waves, and the psychological effects of music on the learning process. His landmark books included *The Physical Basis of Piano Touch and Tone*, and *The Physiological Mechanics of Piano Technique*. At the request of the American Association of Learned Societies, he formed a Committee of Musicology, forerunner of the American Musicology Society, concerned with scientific research in music.

Ortmann organized the Conservatory's "Friday Afternoon Concert Series," strengthened the conservatory's Research Department (the first music conservatory to have such a department); broadened the curriculum; and furthered academic ties with the Johns Hopkins University and Goucher College. Students from these institutions were able to study music at the Peabody Conservatory of Music and earn a Bachelor of Music degree in 1926, and a Master of Music degree in 1935. Ortmann invited such distinguished musical artists to appear in Peabody recitals as Russian-born pianist Vladimir Horowitz, Russian cellist Gregor Piatigorsky, Hungarian-born pianist Rudolph Serkin, Spanish guitarist Andres Segovia, and Polish-born pianist Arthur Rubenstein.

The 1930s depression led the trustees to consider dividing the directorship into administration and academic areas. When this plan did not materialize, an advisory committee recommended appointment of a new director. Despite controversy, the assessment was that Ortmann had served the Peabody Conservatory of Music well during the nation's worst depression. After resigning from the Peabody Conservatory on September 1, 1941, he joined the Goucher College music department in 1942 and was its chairman during 1943-56.

Conservatory Director R. Stewart. Fourth Conservatory director Reginald Stewart during 1941-58, or for 17 years, was born in Edinburgh, Scotland. His father, a distinguished organist, guided his son in piano, organ, and composition. Young Stewart also studied in France and Canada. He founded and conducted the Toronto Philharmonic Orchestra, formed the Bach Society in Toronto, inaugurated the popular Promenade Symphony Concerts in Canada, and for 10 years was a piano teacher and a conductor at the Toronto Conservatory of Music. Unlike Randolph and Ortmann, both Peabody Conservatory of Music graduates and faculty members, Stewart was European trained and had been a conductor and pianist in England. He had attracted the Peabody Conservatory trustees' attention while successfully conducting the New York City Orchestra during Carnegie Hall's 1940-41 season. While Peabody Conservatory director, Stewart also conducted the Baltimore Symphony Orchestra during 1942-52.

Building on Ortmann's curriculum, Stewart gained for the Conservatory academic accreditation by the National Association of Schools of Music in 1950 and membership in the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools in 1955. To serve outlying areas and also to alleviate parking and transportation difficulties, Stewart started Peabody Conservatory branches in Glen Burnie, Dundalk, and Towson. He initiated joint degree programs with Loyola College, Towson State University, and McCoy College (a Johns Hopkins University division offering part-time and continuing education programs). Because of diminishing audiences and growing deficits, Stewart replaced the traditional Friday Afternoon Recitals with Candlelight Concerts, performed by Stewart's newly formed Little Orchestra, made up of Peabody Conservatory faculty and Baltimore Symphony Orchestra musicians.

Because of good relations with the Baltimore Symphony Orchestra (Stewart appointed principal Orchestra musicians as Conservatory teachers) and by employing European musicians during and after World War II, Stewart assembled the Conservatory of Music's largest and most illustrious faculty. His resignation in late 1957 prompted the trustees to reevaluate the Conservatory's role. They followed an outside consultant's (Harrison Keller) advice to keep admission standards high.

Conservatory Director Peter Mennin. Fifth Conservatory director Peter Mennin during 1958-62, or for four years, was born in Erie, PA. He studied music at age seven, produced his first symphony at age 19, attended Oberlin Conservatory, OH; received his bachelor's and master's degrees from the Eastman School of Music, and the Ph.D. degree from the University of Rochester. He served in the U.S. Air Force in World War II and, at the unusually young age of 24, left the faculty of the Juilliard School of Music to become Peabody Conservatory director a year after the 1957 centennial of the Peabody Institute's founding.

Peter Mennin's many honors made him, after Asger Hamerik, the Peabody Conservatory of Music director with the greatest international reputation. Mennin believed in uncompromisingly high standards for performing artists. He established the Conservatory of Music Doctor of Musical Arts degree in 1963. To provide students with professional experience in a conservatory setting, Mennin founded the Peabody Art Theater, providing young opera singers with studies that included performances, management experience, and

labor union relations experience. He also created the Conservatory's American Conductor's Project, an annual Alumni Homecoming, and the conferral of honorary degrees, which helped attract the musical world's attention to the Peabody Conservatory of Music.

Mennin also appointed important artist-teachers to the faculty who would in turn attract talented students. He hired Charles S. Kent as Conservatory of Music dean. When Mennin resigned on October 31, 1962, to become president of the Juilliard School of Music, Kent became director. With Mennin's resignation, a trustees' committee met to ponder what to do about recurring Institute deficits.

Library Deficits. Deficits became worrisome in the early 1950s during sixth Peabody librarian Lloyd Arnold Brown's tenure, 1942-56, or for 14 years. He came to the Peabody Library from Ann Arbor, MI, where he had been curator of maps at the University of Michigan Library. After his Peabody Library years he was director of the Chicago Historical Society, 1956-58; and director of research for Historic Annapolis, Inc., working with maps and other historical records to restore the Annapolis waterfront area.

Librarian Brown found it increasingly difficult to meet budget needs from the original endowment. The library was less used than in its heyday. During 1949-52 the library served an average of 15 researchers a day. Library hours were extended in 1952 from 9 to 9 on weekdays, 9 to 5 Saturdays, and 2 to 5 Sundays (50 attended the first Sunday opening, July 14, 1952). Possible merger talks between the Peabody Library and the Enoch Pratt Free Library were reported in 1953, but nothing happened.

Seventh Peabody Librarian Frank Nicholas Jones (during 1956-66, or for 10 years) was a native of Reading, PA, with degrees from Harvard College and Columbia University School of Library Service. He had been assistant librarian of the New York City Bar Association Library; librarian in Newburyport, MA (where George Peabody had worked in his brother's drapery shop); was deputy supervisor of Boston Public Library Reference Division; had served in the U.S. Army in Europe; was administrative assistant at Harvard College Library; and came to the Peabody Library after being librarian at Ohio University in Athens.

Library Merger Talks. Peabody library merger talks surfaced again during 1963-64 under Librarian Jones as plans developed for enlarging the reference section of the Johns Hopkins University's Milton S. Eisenhower Library. A November 12, 1963, *Sun* article, described some Baltimoreans' objections to the suggested transfer of the Peabody Library collection from its Peabody Library building to the Johns Hopkins University Library. Such a move, they said, would be contrary to George Peabody's intent. Others accepted the idea to help solve the Peabody Library's financial troubles and to keep the reference collection intact, even if not in its original home. Although Johns Hopkins University President Milton S. Eisenhower (U.S. President Dwight D. Eisenhower's brother) urged the merger as mutually beneficial, it did not take place until 1982. The stumbling block was that the Johns Hopkins University officials could not find a satisfactory way to maintain the Peabody Library building as a library facility, as the Peabody trustees insisted, after removing the research collections.

The failed 1963-64 Peabody Library-Johns Hopkins University merger talks gave way to informal discussions about possible affiliation with the Enoch Pratt Free Library. A suggestion in March 1966 was that the Enoch Pratt administer the Peabody Library, that most of the research collection be transferred to the Enoch Pratt, and that the Peabody Library building, as the George Peabody Branch of the Enoch Pratt Library, become a study center for genealogy, maps, and medieval studies. Objections to this proposal reverberated for several years. A legal suit brought against the Peabody Institute and the City of Baltimore to prevent transfer of the Peabody Library collection to the Enoch Pratt was not settled until July 1970, when the Maryland Court of Appeals ruled in favor of the proposed transfer.

What bothered the Baltimore scholarly community about the proposed Peabody Library-Enoch Pratt merger was the proposal to sell some 100,000 Peabody Library volumes (since the Enoch Pratt could not house all the volumes) and use the money to restore the Peabody Library building. A Johns Hopkins University faculty resolution of October 7, 1966, voiced "deep apprehension" about "the possible loss to this city of one of its richest scholarly and cultural resources," stating that the 100,000 volumes to be sold (for about $1 million) were among the most valuable and irreplaceable in the Peabody Library collection.

Peabody Library of the Enoch Pratt Library. This proposed book sale did not materialize. But the Peabody Library did become part of the Enoch Pratt Free Library for 16 years, from July 2, 1966, to July 1, 1982, supported by the City of Baltimore. A June 23, 1966, *Sun* article described the Peabody Library as initially "among the nation's largest and finest scholarly libraries" but that "dwindling income and exploding knowledge" had "caught up with [it]." A successful fundraising campaign in the early 1970s helped clean and refurbish the main Peabody Library reading room, and paid for better lighting fixtures and air conditioning. A $27,000 restoration in early 1977 removed a century of soot and revealed gold leaf rosettes on the five-tier library cast iron grillwork. The Peabody Library collection in its original building was thus saved as a continued source of Baltimore's cultural pride.

Peabody Library of the Johns Hopkins University Library. Budget cuts, however, in the late 1970s and early 1980s forced the City of Baltimore to discontinue supporting the Peabody Library as part of the Enoch Pratt Free Library. In the summer of 1982 trustees from the Enoch Pratt, the Peabody Institute, and the Johns Hopkins University agreed to transfer administration of the Peabody Library to the Johns Hopkins University. After July 1, 1982, Enoch Pratt Librarian Evelyn L. Hart skillfully supervised the merger of the Peabody Library, its 250,000 volumes, and seven staff members into the Peabody Library department of the Milton S. Eisenhower Special Collections Division of the Johns Hopkins University. Lynn Hart, as she was familiarly called, was a native Baltimorean, a graduate of Goucher College, and had a master's degree in library science from Catholic University of America. She worked at Enoch Pratt, 1942-50, as school liaison librarian, was head circulation librarian at Goucher College, 1950-58, returning to Enoch Pratt as head of book selection, 1965-76, when she headed the Peabody Library of Enoch Pratt and administered the transfer of the Peabody

Library to the Johns Hopkins University library system.

For the Johns Hopkins University the Peabody Library was a valuable acquisition, since its holdings included such treasures as 55 incunabula (books published before 1500), 500 Bibles in 18 languages, a rare four-volume set of John James Audubon's *Birds of America*, and an extensive genealogical collection. (Most of Peabody's genealogical records were recently transferred to the Maryland Historical Society.) A proposal in 1989 to raise funds by selling 10 sets of rare Peabody Library books, including Audubon's *Birds of America*, raised a lament in a letter in the *Sun* that the collection "is a time capsule of 19th century intelligence whose integrity deserves respectful maintenance."

Many thought it appropriate that the Peabody Library of Baltimore would be helped to continue as a productive research and reference library by the Enoch Pratt Free Library and the Johns Hopkins University. Their founders had been George Peabody's fellow Baltimore merchants and friends. His philanthropic example had influenced them. It seemed fitting that their institutions sustain his institution.

Peabody Art Collection On Loan. Much of the Peabody Gallery of Art collection is still owned by the Peabody Institute and is exhibited regularly in the Baltimore Museum of Art, Walters Art Gallery, the Peale Museum, and the Maryland Historical Society. The art collection is well-documented in the Peabody Archives where annual reports, letters, exhibition facts and publicity, catalogues, and correspondence tell the history of the major art items. Peabody art items continue to appear in significant exhibitions, including Mary Cassatt's "Young Woman in Black" in the "Two Hundred Years of American Painting" exhibit, sent abroad by the U.S. Information Agency for the U.S. Bicentennial Celebration. The Cassatt painting was also included in *The New Paintings: Impressionism 1874-1886* at the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco and the National Gallery of Art in 1986. In 1982, several Peabody-owned paintings appeared in the Smithsonian Institution Traveling Exhibition, "American Impressionism," which went to Paris, France, and several East European cities. Peabody Institute art works were in the 1987-88 *New Horizons American Painting 1840-1910* exhibit touring the USSR as part of the U.S.-Soviet Cultural Accord signed in Geneva in the summer of 1985.

Just as the Enoch Pratt Free Library and the Johns Hopkins University had helped save the Peabody Library reference collection, so too many thought it proper that Baltimore's premier art depositories should house, safeguard, and show art treasures from what had been Baltimore's first and the U.S.'s third oldest art gallery.

Conservatory Director C. S. Kent. More viable, the Peabody Conservatory of Music also faced the challenge of rapidly rising operating costs amid mounting competition from many more private and especially state-subsidized public college and university music schools. Sixth Conservatory director Charles S. Kent, during 1963-67, or for four years, had earned the bachelor's degree in music theory from the University of Louisville (where his father was president); the Master of Music degree from the Eastman School of Music; and the Ph. D. degree from the University of Rochester. He also studied at Dartmouth College and the Juilliard School of Music. He received the Bronze Star for World War II service in England. He taught at Oberlin Conservatory, Western Reserve University, the New England Conservatory of Music, was dean of the University of Mississippi's Music School, and taught music theory at Indiana University's Music Department.

Kent, widely known and respected as a music educator and scholar, continued Mennin's intent for the Conservatory to train musical performers, prepare music teachers, and be a leader in the musical community. During Kent's nearly five years as director in the 1960s, higher education expanded considerably. The Peabody Conservatory of Music also increased its services through concert tours, cooperative programs with other institutions and artists, radio and television programs, larger summer schools in Baltimore, and Conservatory of Music branches in Northampton, MA, and Towson, MD. To accompany undergraduate and graduate enrollment growth, an associate director was added in 1966. Kent began a Peabody Development Fund campaign which raised $850,000 by 1965. His failing health required a leave of absence in December 1967 and led to his resignation in May 1968.

Associate director Ray E. Robinson, acting Conservatory director during 1967-68, had attended San Jose State College for the bachelor of arts degree and Indiana University for the master of music degree. After military service, he was music conductor and arranger for west coast educational television productions. His Indiana University doctoral dissertation was "A History of the Peabody Conservatory of Music," June 1969. His subsequent music career was as president, Westminster Choir College, and as distinguished professor at Palm Beach Atlantic University, Florida.

Conservatory Director R. F. Goldman. Seventh Conservatory director Richard Franko Goldman, during 1968-77, or for nine years, was the son of the founder of the [Edwin Franko] Goldman Concert Band in New York City. He graduated in 1930 from Columbia University, forming a lifelong friendship with fellow student Jacques Barzun. He studied music privately, was associate conductor of the Goldman Band under his father, 1937-56, and at his father's death, he succeeded him as conductor from 1956. He taught at the Juilliard School of Music, 1947-60; was a visiting music professor at Princeton, Columbia, and New York universities; and a music writer and scholar of note. Two Peabody trustees interviewed him in New York in the spring of 1968. He visited Baltimore in May 1968. Offered the post, Goldman accepted on condition that he be both Conservatory director and Peabody Institute president (his concern was to clarify administrative authority). After a year as director, Goldman became the Peabody Institute president in the fall of 1969. The trustees believed Goldman's national reputation would help maintain the Conservatory's standard of excellence, attract major faculty who would in turn attract promising students, and raise funds needed to perpetuate the prestigious but financially troubled century-old Peabody Institute.

A dormitory-cafeteria-parking garage complex, designed by Edward Durrell Stone, opened during Goldman's first year. He revived the Peabody Scholarly Lecture series, with Jacques Barzun as the first speaker; rekindled interest in the long neglected Peabody Gallery of Art collection (he made the first full catalogue of the Institute's art holdings); strengthened the Conservatory's liberal arts program; and began survey courses in the fine arts.

Financial Crisis. Although $170,000 was raised from the Rockefeller Foundation in 1970, Goldman's annual report on June 1, 1974, stated, "I am discouraged by the long range prospects." His April 20, 1975, letter to Jacques Barzun confided his intent to retire: "The Peabody is facing real trouble financially, and I can't carry the thing myself." In a January 1976 press conference, Goldman drew public attention to Peabody's financial plight. Since 1971, he said, the Peabody Institute's $6 million endowment had shrunk to $3 million. The only course left, he said, was to sell the art collection then valued at about $1 million (some few pieces had been sold in the 1960s). The threatened art sale provoked public attention and concern. The *Evening Sun* for February 24, 1976, reported that committees from the Peabody Institute and the Johns Hopkins University were considering affiliation. By June 1976 a working agreement was reached. The *Sun* for December 21, 1976, headlined "Peabody to Join Hopkins," and continued, "The famous but deficit-ridden Peabody Institute will be taken under the wing of the Johns Hopkins University next summer." Goldman explained that the Peabody Institute had been operating at a deficit the last dozen years and that the operating budget in 1976 was $2,761,294, which included a deficit of $150,000.

Hopkins-Peabody Merger. The merger agreement was that the Peabody Institute would retain its autonomy but would be under the Johns Hopkins University management and share the university's superior fundraising resources. The Peabody Library continued its research and reference function in its own building as part of the Enoch Pratt Free Library and under city funding during 1965-82. But budget cuts compelled the Enoch Pratt Free Library to release the Peabody Library. On July 1, 1982, the still intact Peabody Library became a special collection of the Johns Hopkins University's Milton S. Eisenhower Library. Goldman delayed retirement until affiliation was completed. He died in Baltimore in 1980, praised for the trust he had generated.

There were mixed feelings about the lost independence of the Peabody Institute, which had for some 110 years been part of the city's and the nation's cultural life. The more realistic were glad that the Johns Hopkins University had helped infuse the Peabody Institute with continued life. George Peabody College for Teachers had merged with Vanderbilt University in Nashville (1979). The Peabody Institute and the Johns Hopkins University had merged in Baltimore in 1982. The Peabody institutions in Nashville and in Baltimore had long enjoyed friendly and cooperative relations with their neighboring universities. It seemed fitting that the Peabody institutions join resources with their university neighbors to assure continued service.

The Peabody Conservatory of Music's affiliation with the Johns Hopkins University took place during Elliott Galkin's tenure as the Conservatory's ninth director during 1977-83, or for seven years. Extensive renovations were made from a $1 million gift from local magnate Sidney Friedberg in memory of his wife whom he met when both were studying piano at the Peabody Conservatory of Music. The Sidney Friedberg Concert Hall was dedicated on October 8, 1983, when Robert Pierce became the Conservatory's tenth director.

The Peabody Institute remains a marble and red brick complex in the heart of Baltimore's historic Mount Vernon Place. Scholars still use the library's resources. Visitors still enjoy the building's grandeur and art works. Lectures still delight, inform, and entertain. Music students still study Bach, Beethoven, and other classical composers. But some Peabody Conservatory students also compose and perform the new electronic music, using the latest digital synthesis software. Peabody was the first American conservatory with a computer music department. A degree in recording engineering since 1983 allows students to combine Peabody Conservatory music classes with courses in the Johns Hopkins' G.W.C. Whiting School of Engineering. In 1992 the Peabody Conservatory enrolled 538 students from around the world, 280 of them graduate students, and 258 undergraduate students. After nearly a century and a half of change, the Peabody Institute library, music conservatory, art, and lectures still serve Baltimore and the nation.

Peabody's Educational Influence

Contributions to Science. Peabody, who paid for the education of his nieces and nephews, helped one nephew, O. C. Marsh, become the first U.S. professor of paleontology at Yale (and the second in the world). Nephew Marsh induced his uncle to give $150,000 each for science museums to Harvard (archaeology and ethnology) and Yale (natural science), and $140,000 for a museum of maritime history in Salem, MA. Peabody's three museums of science were important gifts made when the classics dominated higher education and science fought for acceptance in the curriculum.

George Peabody's educational legacy 200 years after his birth includes the six Peabody library institutes and lecture funds he founded well before the Andrew Carnegie public library era; Peabody's direct influence on Johns Hopkins to found the Johns Hopkins University, Hospital, and Medical School; and on Enoch Pratt to endow the Enoch Pratt Free Library of Baltimore. He also founded in London the first privately funded low-cost model housing for low-income working families, where some 19,000 people currently live.

George Peabody made less money than many later philanthropists and gave much of it for educational purposes before foundations were established for tax advantage. To accumulate money to leave in estates to one's children is natural. Peabody went beyond this normal goal in his 1852 sentiment, "Education, a debt due from present to future generations." The explanation he wrote to his nephew, "I can only do to those who come under my care, as I could have wished circumstances had permitted others to have done by me," is one clue to his philanthropic motivation. His educational legacy continues at the two hundredth anniversary of his birth (1795-1995). That educational legacy may be a reminder for our time to do for others as we would have them do for us—that is, to share burdens, to open the way for others.

References: Peabody Education Fund

Historians who praised the PEF's influence on public education in the South include: E. Merton Coulter, *The South During Reconstruction, 1855-1877* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1947), 327. Harvey Wish, *Society and Thought in Modern America* (New York: Longmans Green and Co., 1952), II, 37. Edgar W. Knight, *Public Education in the South* (New

York: Ginn and Co., 1922), 383-414; and Edgar W. Knight, *Education in the United States* (New York: Ginn and Co., 1951), 555. Paul H. Buck, *The Road to Reunion, 1865-1900* (Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1937), 164, 166. Abraham Flexner, with collaborator Esther S. Bailey, *Funds and Foundations: Their Policies Past and Present* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952), 11. William Knox Tate, "Elementary Education in the South," *The South in the Building of a Nation, A History of the Southern States* (Richmond, VA: The Southern Historical Publication Society, 1909), 291. J. L. M. Curry, "The Peabody Education Fund," *Educational Review*, XIII (March 1897), 226. Daniel Coit Gilman, "Five Great Gifts," *The Outlook*, LXXXVI, No. 13 (July 27, 1907), 648-652 and 657. Thomas D. Clark, *The Southern Country Editor* (New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1948), 30. Charles William Dabney, *Universal Education in the South*, 2 Vols. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1936), I.101, 104. William Torrey Harris is quoted in J. L. M. Curry, *A Brief Sketch of George Peabody and a History of the Peabody Education Fund Through Thirty Years* (Cambridge, MA.: John Wilson and Son, 1898), 230. Jesse Brundage Sears, *Philanthropy in the History of American Higher Education*. Bulletin No. 26 (Washington, DC: United States Bureau of Education, 1922), 91. John F. Kasprzak, "George Peabody and the Peabody Education Fund: A Study in Reconciliation" (MA, American University, June 1966).

The PEF's influence and leaders are in Peabody Education Fund, *Proceedings of the Trustees of the Peabody Education Fund From Their Original Organization on the 8th of February, 1867* (Boston: John Wilson & Sons, 1875), Vol. I, 1867-74 (plus 6 volumes of *Proceedings*, 1875-1916). J. L. M. Curry, *A Brief Sketch of George Peabody and a History of the Peabody Education Fund Through Thirty Years* (New York: Negro Universities Press, 1969, reprint of 1898 edition). Leonard P. Ayres, *Seven Great Foundations* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1911). Ullin Whitney Leavell, *Philanthropy in Negro Education* (Nashville, TN: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1930). Hoy Taylor, *An Interpretation of the Early Administration of the Peabody Education Fund*. Contributions to Education No. 114 (Nashville, TN.: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1933). Daniel C. Gilman, "Thirty Years of the Peabody Education Fund," *Atlantic Monthly*, LXXIX (February 1897), 161-166. Joseph Walter Brouillette, "The Third Phase of the Peabody Education Fund, 1904-1914" (Ph. D., George Peabody College for Teachers, 1940). Thomas Michael Drake, "The Impact of the Peabody Education Fund on the Development of Tax-Supported Education in Tennessee, 1867-1880" (Ed. D., Tennessee State University, 1990). Earle H. West, "The Peabody Fund and Negro Education, 1867-1880," *History of Education Quarterly*, VI (Summer 1966), 3-21. Earle H. West, "The Life and Educational Contributions of Barnas Sears" (Ph. D., George Peabody College for Teachers, 1961). Howard Turner, "Robert M. Lusher, Louisiana Educator" (Ph. D., Louisiana State University, 1944).

Second PEF agent J. L. M. Curry's work and influence is described in William J. Lewis, "The Educational Speaking of Jabez L.M. Curry" (Ph. D., University of Florida, 1955). Richard Connelley Peck, "Jabez Lamar Monroe Curry: Educational Crusader" (Ph. D., George Peabody College for Teachers, 1942). Jessie Pearl Rice, *J. L. M. Curry, Southerner, Statesman and Educator* (New York: King's Crown Press, 1949). J. L. M. Curry's educational philosophy about Black education is in Donald Spivey, *Schooling for the New Slavery: Black Industrial Education, 1868-1915*: Contributions in Afro-American and African Studies, No. 38 (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1978), 28, 32, 37, 77-84.

The PEF's influence in specific southern states, criticism of its policy of aiding Black schools at two-thirds the amount for White schools, and criticism for contributing to segregated Black education is in William P. Vaughn, *Schools for All: The Blacks and Public Education in the South, 1865-1877* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1974); and William P. Vaughn, "Partners in Segregation: Barnas Sears and the Peabody Fund," *Civil War History*, X, No. 3 (1964), 260-274. Kenneth R. Johnson, "The Peabody Fund: Its Role and Influence in Alabama," *Alabama Review*, XXVII, No. 2 (April, 1974), 101-126. F. Bruce Rosen, "The Influence of the Peabody Fund on Education in Reconstruction Florida," *Florida Historical Quarterly*, LV, No. 3 (1977), 310-320. Hugh Victor Brown, *A History of the Education of Negroes in North Carolina* (Raleigh: Irving Swain Press, 1961). Henry Allen Bullock, *A History of Negro Education in the South From 1619 to the Present* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967). Horace Mann Bond, *Negro Education in Alabama: A Study in Cotton and Steel* (New York: Octagon Books, 1969). Horace Mann Bond, *The Education of the Negro in the American Social Order* (New York: Octagon Books, 1966, revision of 1934 edition). Willard Range, *The Rise and Progress of Negro College in Georgia 1865-1949* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1951). Robert G. Sherer, *Subordination or Liberation? The Development and Conflicting Theories of Black Education in Nineteenth Century Alabama* (University: University of Alabama Press, 1977). Henry J. Perkinson, *The Imperfect Panacea: American Faith in Education 1865-1990* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1991), 29.

References: George Peabody College for Teachers of Vanderbilt University

Methodist Bishop N. H. McTyeire and Cornelius Vanderbilt's relationship and Vanderbilt's $1 million gift to Vanderbilt University are in Vanderbilt History Professor Paul K. Conkin's book (assisted by Henry Lee Swint and Patricia S. Miletich), *Gone with the Ivy: A Biography of Vanderbilt University* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1985), pp. 15-17, and Sarah K. Bolton, *Famous Givers and their Gifts* (Freeport, NY: Books for Libraries Press, 1971 reprint of 1896 edition), pp. 307-308. Peabody's history is in Jack Allen's two articles: "The Peabody Saga," *Peabody Reflector*, LIII, No. 2 (Summer 1980), pp. 4-13; and "Peabody: A Tale of Two Centuries," *Peabody Reflector*, LVIII, No. 2 (Spring 1986), pp. 19-23. Chancellor Kirkland's attempt to absorb Peabody Normal College, Kirkland-Payne differences, steps leading to 1979 merger, and merger consequences are objectively told (from Vanderbilt University archive sources) in Conkin (see book's index for the many entries).

Peabody College President Bruce R. Payne is described in William W. Force, *Payne of Peabody: An Apostle of Education* (Nashville: Privately printed, 1985).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

William W. Force, *A Short History of George Peabody College for Teachers, 1974-1979* (Nashville: Williams Printing Co., 1986) holds that Peabody had the resources to continue independently.

Peabody College Professors Jack Allen, Raymond C. Norris, and Ida Long Rogers wrote: George Peabody College for Teachers, *Design for the Future: A Report from the Select Committee on Peabody's Second Century to President John Dunworth and the Board of Trustees* (Nashville: George Peabody College for Teachers, August 29, 1974), 107 recommendations.

Early Peabody-Vanderbilt connections and individuals are in Wallace Beasley, *The Life and Educational Contributions of James D. Porter* (Nashville: Bureau of Publications, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1950). Harvie Branscomb, *Purely Academic: An Autobiography* (Nashville: Vanderbilt University, 1978). George A. Dillingham, *The Foundation of the Peabody Tradition* (Lanham, MD.: University Press of America, 1989). Edwin Mims, *Chancellor Kirkland of Vanderbilt* (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1940). Edwin Mims, *History of Vanderbilt University* (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1946). Vanderbilt University, *Vanderbilt University Centennial: The Program and Addresses Given on October 3, 1975, Celebrating the One Hundredth Anniversary of the Ceremonies that Opened the University* (Nashville: Vanderbilt University, 1976).

The Peabody-Vanderbilt 1979 merger is described in "Boards Vote Peabody Merger," *Vanderbilt Gazette*, No. 111 (May 16, 1979), pp. 1, 12. "The Committee of Visitors," *The Peabody Reflector*, LII, No. 3 (Autumn 1979), pp. 10, 12. Alexander Heard, "A Vanderbilt Perspective on the Merger," *Peabody Reflector*, LII, No. 2 (Summer 1979), pp. 4-5. Bill Hiles, "A New Era Dawns...," *Peabody Reflector*, LII, No. 1 (Spring 1979), pp. 4-5. "How Students See the Merger," *Peabody Reflector*, LII, No. 3 (Autumn 1979), pp. 13-14. "Peabody-Vanderbilt Merger Information," *Peabody Reflector*, Special Section, LI, No. 4 (Winter 1979), pp. 98 a-h. Hardy C. Wilcoxon, "Continuing Our Mission," *Peabody Reflector*, LII, No. 2 (Summer 1979), pp. 2-3.

Related Peabody College sources are John Dale Russell, *Report of the Study of Closer Cooperation Between George Peabody College for Teachers and Vanderbilt University* (Nashville, May 1962) and "President Claunch Dies," *The Peabody Reflector*, LXII, No. 1 (Spring 1991), p. 2. Edward Neely Cullum, "George Peabody College for Teachers, 1914-1937" (Ed. D., George Peabody College for Teachers, 1963). George A. Dillingham, *The Foundation of the Peabody Tradition* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1989). Mary S. Hoffschwelle, "The Science of Domesticity: Home Economics at George Peabody College for Teachers, 1914-1939," *Journal of Southern History*,, LVII, No. 4 (1991), 659-680.

Peabody College progress since 1979, under Dean Willis D. Hawley, is in Alexander Heard, "A Vanderbilt Perspective on the Merger," *Peabody Reflector*, LII, No. 2 (Summer 1979), pp. 4-5. Hardy C Wilcoxon, "Continuing Our Mission," *Peabody Reflector*, LII, No. 2 (Summer 1979), pp. 2-3. Willis D. Hawley, "From the Dean," *Peabody Reflector*, LVIII, No. 2 (Spring 1986), p. 2, and *Peabody Reflector*, LIX, No. 2 (Fall 1987), p. 2. "Centuries of Influence: A Celebration of Library Science at Peabody," *Peabody Reflector*, LIX, No. 2 (Fall 1987), pp. 9, 11. Nelson Bryan, "The Dean and the Decade: Willis Hawley, Completing His Deanship, Reflects on Peabody's First Ten Years as a School of Vanderbilt University," *Peabody Reflector*, LXI, No. 1 (Fall 1989), pp. 12-15. "Technology Can Reconstruct Classroom Instruction," *Vanderbilt Register*, 12-8-89, n.p. "Peabody gets $80,000 Grant," *Vanderbilt Register* (Dec. 8, 1989), p. 7. Jean Crawford, "Learning with Jasper," *Peabody Reflector*, LXI, No. 2 (Summer 1990), pp. 26-27. "VU's Peabody Holds Top Ranking Again," *Nashville Banner*, February 18, 1991, p. B-5; "Peabody Top Choice in Education," *Peabody Columns*, I, No. 7 (March 1991), p. 2.

Peabody College progress under Dean Pellegrino are in "New Peabody Dean Eager to Help State Change Face of Education, Tennessean, December 26, 1991, p. 3B. "Pellegrino Announces Faculty Searches in Each Department," *Peabody Columns*, II, 45 (January 1992), p. 1. Marcelle Robertson, "New Dean to Work for 'Answers,'" *Vanderbilt Hustler*, CIV, No. 1 (January 14, 1992), pp. 1, 11. James Pellegrino, "From the Dean," *Peabody Reflector*, LXIII, 2 (Fall 1992), inside front cover. "Campus Links to National, Metro K-12 Alliances," *Vanderbilt Register* (September 17 and 21, 1992), pp. 1,6; and "New Initiatives Strengthen VU/Metro Ties," *Peabody Columns*, III, 5 (January 1993), p. 2. "SR Building to Return as Focal Point for Campus," *Peabody Columns*, III, 7 (March 1993), pp. 1-2. *Vanderbilt Register* (May 3-16, 1993), pp. 1, 5.

References: Peabody Institute of Baltimore

General works on the Peabody Institute of Baltimore include Elizabeth Schaaf (compiler), *Guide to the Archives of the Peabody Institute of the City of Baltimore 1857-1977* (Baltimore: Archives of the Peabody Institute of the Johns Hopkins University, 1987). *The Peabody: An Illustrated Guide* (Baltimore: Peabody Institute of the Johns Hopkins University, 1977). Sherry H. Olson, *Baltimore: The Building of an American City* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980), pp. 105, 168, 192. An early history is Roseann Kahn, "A History of the Peabody Institute Library, Baltimore, Maryland, 1857-1916" (M.S. in L.S., Catholic University of America, 1953), published as ACRL Microcard Series No. 16 (Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press for the Association of College and Reference Libraries, 1954), 87 pages.

John Pendleton Kennedy's shaping of the Peabody Institute of Baltimore is in Charles H. Bohner, *John Pendleton Kennedy: Gentleman from Baltimore* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1961), pp. 214-215, 234, 235, 238, 239.

George Peabody's influence on Johns Hopkins and the placing of his seated statue near the Peabody Institute are in Harold A. Williams, *Robert Garrett & Sons Incorporated: Origin and Development: 1840-1965* (Baltimore: 1965), pp. 27, 30, 32-33, 52-53, 56, 65.

John G. Morris as first librarian is in George Harvey Genzmer, "Morris, John Gottlieb (Nov. 14, 1803-Oct. 10, 1895)," *Dictionary of American Biography*, edited by Dumas Malone (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934), Volume VII, pp. 212-213; and in "Morris, John Godlove," *National Cyclopedia of American Biography* (New York: James T. White & Co., 1893), Vol. III, p. 61. See his John G. Morris, *Life Reminiscences of an Old*

Lutheran Minister (Philadelphia: Lutheran Publication Society, 1896)

Nathaniel Holmes Morison as provost and librarian is in Samuel Eliot Morison, *Nathaniel Holmes Morison, 1815-1890: Provost of the Peabody Institute of Baltimore, 1867-1890, An Address...February 12, 1957* (Baltimore: Peabody Institute Library, 1962). "Morison, Nathaniel Holmes," *Biographical Cyclopedia: Representative Men of Maryland and District of Columbia* (Baltimore: National Biographical Publishing Co., 1879), pp. 323-324. [Morison, Nathaniel Holmes], *Peabody Bulletin* (Baltimore), May 1936. N. H. Morison and others compiled the first book catalogue: *Catalogue of the Library of the Peabody Institute of the City of Baltimore* (Baltimore: Peabody Library, 1883-93).

Second Peabody Institute librarian, Philip Reese Uhler, is described in "Uhler, Philip Reese," *Who Was Who in America* (Chicago: A. N. Marquis Co., 1943), Vol. I, p. 1263. "Uhler, Philip Reese," *Dictionary of American Biography*, edited by Dumas Malone (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1943), Vol. XIX, pp. 106-107. "Uhler, Philip Reese," *Biographical Cyclopedia of Representative Men of Maryland and District of Columbia* (Baltimore: National Biographical Publishing Co., 1879), pp. 576-577. "Uhler, Philip Reese," *National Cyclopaedia of American Biography Being the History of the United States* (New York: James T. White and Co., 1900), Vol. VIII, p. 251. "Uhler, Philip Reese," *Appletons' Cyclopaedia of American Biography*, edited by James Grant Wilson and John Fiske (New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1889), Vol. VI, no page.

Louis Henry Dielman as fourth Peabody Librarian is described in [Dielman, Louis Henry], *Baltimore News-Post*, May 30, 1942. "Dielman, Louis Henry," *Maryland History Notes* , XVII, No. 1 (May 1959), p. 2. Robert G. Breen, "A Carroll Colloquy: College Left Its Cachet," *Sun* (Baltimore), February 8, 1952.

Lloyd A. Brown as fifth librarian is described in Peter Young, "Back to the Stacks: Lloyd Brown to Assemble Historical Annapolis Data," *Evening Sun* (Baltimore), November 30, 1960. "Kerr Gets Post in Annapolis," *Evening Sun* (Baltimore), October 31, 1960. Naomi Kellman, "Mr. Peabody's Pet Project," *Sun* (Baltimore), February 9, 1947.

Frank N. Jones as sixth Peabody librarian is described in "New Peabody Librarian," *Gardens, Houses and People* (Baltimore), July 1957. "New Library Director," *Sun* (Baltimore), June 17, 1957.

The Peabody Library during 1947-52 is described in "Fifty Turn Out for First Sunday Open-Day at Peabody Library," *Sun* (Baltimore), January 14, 1952. James H. Bready, "Peabody Institute Library," *Sun* (Baltimore), January 6, 1952.

Legal and other controversies on proposals to sell part of the Peabody Library collection prior to merger with the Enoch Pratt are in Arthur Joseph Gutman, Letter, "Peabody Library," *Morning Sun* (Baltimore), June 14, 1966. Gerald W. Johnson, Letter, "The Real Question About the Library," *Sun* (Baltimore), April 22, 1966.

Accounts of the Peabody Library-Enoch Pratt 1966 merger are in George Rodgers, "Some of Peabody Library Books Set for Disposal," *Evening Sun* (Baltimore), June 23, 1966. Frank P. L. Somerville, "Peabody-Pratt Tie-Up Weighed," *Sun* (Baltimore), January 22, 1966. Frank P. L. Somerville, "Peabody's Shift of Books Fought," *Sun* (Baltimore), October 1, 1966. Frank P. L. Somerville, "Pratt Board is Silent on Peabody Plan," *Baltimore Sun*, January 22, 1966. John Dorsey, *Mr. Peabody's Library: The Building, The Collection, The Neighborhood* (Baltimore: Enoch Pratt Free Library, 1978). Lawrence J. McCrank, "The Centennial Celebration of the Foundation of the Peabody Library, Baltimore, Maryland: A Report and Review," *Journal of Library History*, XIV, No. 2 (Spring 1979), pp. 183-187. "Pratt Takes Over Peabody," *News American* (Baltimore), July 3, 1966, p. 9B.

The Peabody Library 1977 restoration is in "Soot Hides Treasures. Peabody Library Spruced Up," *Sun* (Baltimore), February 19, 1977.

The 1966 Peabody Library-Enoch Pratt and the 1982 Peabody Library-Johns Hopkins mergers are in Eric Garland, "Has Baltimore Put Its Library on the Shelf," *Baltimore Magazine*, LXXVI, No. 2 (February 1983), pp. 46-51, 102-106. The 1982 Peabody Library-Johns Hopkins merger is in James H. Bready, "What's Ahead for Peabody Library Now That Hopkins Owns It?" *Sun* (Baltimore), July 4, 1982. "The Peabody Library," *Sun* (Baltimore), July 5, 1982. "The Peabody Library Returns," *Peabody News* (August/September 1982), p. 4. Ann Gwyn, "Changing Hands: Johns Hopkins Acquires Peabody Library," *Wilson Library Bulletin*, LVII, No. 5 (January 1983), pp. 401-404.

Objections to selling Peabody Library books in 1989 are in Gunther Wertheimer, "Disgrace at the Peabody," *Evening Sun* (Baltimore), June 9, 1989.

H.L. Mencken's use of the Peabody Library is in John Dorsey, ed., *On Mencken* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1980), p. 54. William Manchester, *Disturber of the Peace: The Life of H.L. Mencken*, (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950), p. 292. *Letters of H.L. Mencken; Selected and Annotated by Guy J. Forgue* (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1981), p. 422. John Dos Passos' research in the Peabody Library is in Townsend Ludington, *John Dos Passos: A Twentieth Century Odyssey* (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1980), p. 456.

The Peabody Library 1957 centennial celebration is in Lawrence J. McCrank, "The Centennial Celebration of the Foundation of the Peabody Library, Baltimore, Maryland: A Report and Review," *Journal of Library History*, Vol. XIV, No. 2 (Spring 1979), pp. 183-187. John Dorsey, *Mr. Peabody's Library: The Building, The Collection, The Neighborhood* (Baltimore: Enoch Pratt Free Library, 1978).

The Peabody Library is also in "Gifts to the Peabody Double Last Year's," *Sun* (Baltimore), July 7, 1978. *The Peabody Institute and Its Future* (Baltimore: Peabody Institute [1957]). "Peabody to Join Hopkins," *Sun* (Baltimore), December 21, 1976, pp. A1 (c. 1), A8 (c. 2-c.5). William T. Snyder, Jr., "Peabody Institute of Baltimore," *Baltimore*, XXXVI, No. 6 (March 1943), pp. 37-38. "Peabody Library Starts 260,000-Card Index," *Evening Sun* (Baltimore), January 10, 1952. Zoë Ingalls, "The Soaring Splendor of the Peabody Library," *Chronicle of Higher Education* , Vol. XL, No. 15 (December 1, 1993), p. B5.

The Peabody Gallery of Art is best described in Elizabeth Schaaf, "Baltimore's Peabody Art Gallery," *The Archives of the American Art Journal*, XXIV, No. 4 (1984), pp. 9-14. Maryland sculptor William Henry Rinehart is described in "Rinehart, William Henry,"

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appletons' Cyclopaedia of American Biography, edited by James Grant Wilson and John Fiske (New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1888), Vol. V, p. 256. William Sener Rusk, "Notes on the Life of William Henry Rinehart, Sculptor," *Maryland Historical Magazine*, Vol. XIX, No. 4 (December 1924), pp. 309-338. [William Henry Rinehart], *Sun* (Baltimore), January 5, 1936. Lynn D. Poole, "Mantle of Success," *Sun* (Baltimore), May 16, 1948. W. S. R., "Rinehart, William Henry," *Dictionary of American Biography*, edited by Dumas Malone (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1943), Vol. 15, pp. 615-617.

The Peabody Conservatory of Music catalogue, *Peabody Conservatory of Music, Academic Years 1991-93* (Baltimore: Peabody Institute of the Johns Hopkins University, 1991) and later issues. See also "Peabody Institute, Baltimore," *The International Cyclopedia of Music and Musicians*, edited by Oscar Thompson (New York: Dodd, Mead and Co., 1975), p. 1640.

May Garrettson Evans as Peabody Prep school founder is in Elizabeth Schaaf, "From Idea to Tradition: The Peabody Prep, *Music Educators Journal*, 72, No. 1 (September 1985), pp. 38-43. Margie H. Luckett, "May Garrettson Evans," *Maryland Women, Baltimore, Maryland, 1937*, p. 106. [Evans, May Garrettson], *Evening Sun* (Baltimore), November 29, 1934. "Peabody Preparatory School Founder to be Honored Sunday," *Sun* (Baltimore), May 21, 1947. [Evans, May Garrettson], *Evening Sun* (Baltimore), November 29, 1934. [Evans, May Garrettson], "Baltimore," Chapter XXXVII in Ishbel Ross, *Ladies of the Press: The Story of Women in Journalism by an Insider* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1936), pp. 493-497. Mason Ancker, "Teaching the Beginnings of Music: Peabody Preparatory Department Has a Thirty-Four-Year Record," *Sunday Sun Magazine* (Baltimore, undated). Elizabeth Schaaf, "From Idea to Tradition: The Peabody Prep," *Music Educators Journal*, LXXII, No. 1 (September 1985), pp. 38-43.

Material on poet Sidney Lanier is in "Lanier, Sidney," *Appletons' Cyclopaedia of American Biography*, edited by James Grant Wilson and John Fiske (New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1888), Vol. III, p. 613. Brian McGinty, "A Shining Presence: Rebel Poet Sidney Lanier Goes to War," *Civil War Times Illustrated*, XIX, No. 2 (May 1980), pp. 25-31. Weimer Jones, "The Last Days of Sidney Lanier," *Sun* (Baltimore), February 4, 1968. Frederick Kelly, "Sidney Lanier at the Peabody Institute," *Peabody Bulletin* (Baltimore), 1976?, pp. 35-38. William Stump, "Man in the Street: Sidney Lanier," *Sun* (Baltimore), November 20, 1949. John C. French, "Sidney Lanier's Life in Baltimore: 'The Beautiful City' Has Yet to Discover Him Fully," *Sun* (Baltimore), September 6, 1931. Edward Lucas White, "Reminiscences of Sidney Lanier," *Johns Hopkins Alumni Magazine*, XVII, No. 4 (November 1928-June 1929), pp. 329-331. "Sidney Lanier Commemoration," *Johns Hopkins Alumni Magazine*, XIV, No. 5 (October 1925-June 1926), pp. 480-505.

First Academy of Music director Asger Hamerik is in Isabel L. Dobbin, "Asger Hamerik," *Peabody Bulletin* (Baltimore), April-May 1913, pp. 2-4. "Asger Hamerik April 8, 1843-July 13, 1923," *Peabody Bulletin* (Baltimore), Fall 1923, pp. 4-5. Mike Guiliano, "History of the Peabody Conservatory and Other Related Incidents," *Hopkins News-Letter*, LXXXI, No. 31 (February 11, 1977). [Asger Hamerik], *Peabody Bulletin* (Baltimore), May 1933. "Hamerik, Professor Asger," *Biographical Cyclopedia of Representative Men of Maryland and District of Columbia* (Baltimore: National Biographical Publishing Co.), 1879, pp. 84-86. "Hamerikana: To Asger Hamerik on his Seventieth Birthday. Congratulations and Loving Greetings from His Pupils and Friends" (with extracts from two letters from Sidney Lanier mentioning Hamerik), *Peabody Bulletin* (Baltimore), April-May 1913, p. 5. Otto T. Simon, Letter, "Thinks Asger Hamerik should be Honored by Some Memorial at the Peabody and That His Music Should be Frequently Heard There," *Sun* (Baltimore), April 15, 1922. Elizabeth Ellen Starr, "Asger Hamerik as I Knew Him as Teacher, Artist, Friend, *Peabody Bulletin* (Baltimore), Fall 1923, pp. 6-7. Howard R. Thatcher, "A Teacher Glances Back—Notes on Music in Baltimore," *Evening Sun* (Baltimore), July 12, 1950. Harold Randolph, "Asger Hamerik—An Appreciation," *Peabody Bulletin* (Baltimore), Fall 1923, pp. 5-6.

Otto Rudolph Ortmann as third Conservatory director is in Elliott Galkin, "The Man Who Brought Science into the Music Hall," *Baltimore Magazine*, LXXII, No. 8 (August 1979), pp. 172, 170-171. [Otto Rudolph Ortmann], *Sun* (Baltimore), May 17, 1936. "Otto Ortmann," *Peabody Bulletin* (Baltimore), Fall 1941, pp. 3-4. "Otto Ortmann," *Peabody Bulletin* (Baltimore), May 1936, p. 16. "Otto Ortmann," *Peabody Bulletin* (Baltimore), Fall 1941, pp. 3+. P. J. B., [Otto Ortmann], *Sun* (Baltimore), November 11, 1934. "Three Goucher Faculty Members Retiring," *Evening Sun* (Baltimore), June 22, 1956. Ortmann's landmark books include *The Physical Basis of Piano Touch and Tone* (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1925) and *The Physiological Mechanics of Piano Technique* (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1929); paperback reprint, 1962. "A Decade of Conservatory Activity," *Peabody Bulletin* (Baltimore), December 1938, pp. 33-34.

Reginald Stewart as fourth Conservatory director is in "Bon Voyage—Dr. Reginald Stewart," *Evening Sun* (Baltimore), June 24, 1958. "Conductor Makes Farewell Speech," *Sun* (Baltimore), March 13, 1952. "Director Change [Otto Ortmann, Reginald Stewart]," *Evening Sun* (Baltimore), August 5, 1941. "Little Orchestra Concerts to Continue Under Stewart," *Sun* (Baltimore), February 7, 1958. "Mr. Ortmann and His Successor," *Gardens, Houses and People* (Baltimore), XVI, No. 8 (August 1941). "Progress at the Peabody," *Sun* (Baltimore), January 19, 1942. "Reginald Stewart Named Head of Peabody, "Evening *Sun* (Baltimore), August 5, 1941. "Reginald Stewart, the New Director," *Peabody Bulletin* (Baltimore), Fall 1941, pp. 1-3. "Reginald Stewart's Final Performance as Conductor," *Sun* (Baltimore), April 1, 1952. "Seventy of Symphony Urge Longer Season to Keep Stewart Here," *Sun* (Baltimore), January 31, 1952. "Stewart and the Peabody," *Gardens, Houses and People* (Baltimore), April 1952. "Stewart Defends Symphony Setup, Says He is Underpaid," *Sun* (Baltimore), November 24, 1951. "Stewart to Leave Peabody Conservatory Post in 1958," *Sun* (Baltimore), November 19, 1957. "Stewart's Move to Quit Accepted," *Sun* (Baltimore), February 2, 1952. "The Human Complexities of a Conductor's Job," *Sun* (Baltimore), February 4, 1952. *Peabody Conservatory of Music* (Baltimore: Peabody Institute [1957]).

Peter Mennin as Conservatory Director is in H. Donald Spatz, "Fire Engines, Cow Pastures and Music,"

Forecast! (Washington/Baltimore Entertainment Guide), XIV, No. 11 (January 1978), pp. 60-61. George Kent Bellows, "Music Master: Whirlwind Tempo for Peabody Chief," *Evening Sun* (Baltimore), August 12, 1958. "Music...Mennin of the Peabody," *Gardens, Houses and People* (Baltimore), August 1958. [Peter Mennin], *Evening Sun* (Baltimore), April 8, 1958. "Kathryn Geraghty, "Variations on a Theme in Blue, Green," *Sun* (Baltimore), December 31, 1961. "Mennin Leaving as Peabody Head," *Sun* (Baltimore), June 11, 1962.

Charles Stanton Kent as sixth Conservatory director is in "Succeeds Cooper: Peabody Conservatory Names Kent as Dean," *Baltimore News-Post*, May 19, 1961. "Peabody Names New Director," *Sun* (Baltimore), April 21, 1963. Peter Young, "New Peabody Director: Symphony Could Draw Teachers, He Believes," *Evening Sun* (Baltimore), May 9, 1963. Stephen A. Bennett, "Kent in Doubt, Peabody Scans Field for Director," *Sun* (Baltimore), February 7, 1968. "Illness Obliges Charles Kent to Leave Peabody," *Sun* (Baltimore), May 1, 1968. [Charles Stanton Kent obituary], *Evening Sun* (Baltimore), June 2, 1969.

Raymond Edwin Robinson as 1967-68 interim Conservatory director is in "Peabody Conservatory Lists R. E. Robinson as New Dean," *Sun* (Baltimore) July 2, 1963. Robinson, Raymond Edwin, *Who's Who in Entertainment*, (Place, publisher, year unknown), p. 534. See also Ray E. Robinson, "A History of the Peabody Conservatory of Music" (Doctor of Music Education, Indiana University, 1969).

Richard Franko Goldman as seventh Conservatory director is in "New Peabody Head Named," *Sun* (Baltimore), August 25, 1968. John Pappenheimer, "Goldman Wants Things to Happen," *Evening Sun* (Baltimore), August 27, 1968. Earl Arnett, "Richard Franko Goldman Found a Good School That Needed a Little Shaking Up," *Sun* (Baltimore), April 20, 1973, p. B1. Noel K. Lester, "Richard Franko Goldman: His Life and Works," Doctor of Musical Arts dissertation, Peabody Conservatory of Music, Peabody Institute of The Johns Hopkins University, 1984.

Other Conservatory of Music sources are "New Peabody Dean Named" [David S. Cooper], *Sun* (Baltimore), February 18, 1959; and Richard W. Case, "How the Hopkins and Peabody Got Together," *Sun* (Baltimore), January 3, 1977. "Peabody Students Getting in Tune for Transposition to Hopkins: Some Notes, Quotes, and Thoughts About New School," *Hopkins News-Letter*, LXXXI, No. 31 (February 11, 1977), pp. 1-2. A recent article is Ulrike Huhs, "Peabody Conservatory Generates Sounds of the Future," *Asheville Citizen-Times* (NC), November 28, 1992, p. 4C.

93

IT'S ALL IN THE WAY WE LOOK AT THINGS - IS IT?

Cornell Thomas
Texas Christian University

There is currently much debate and research focussed on reasons why minority children succeed or fail in school and why certain ethnic groups as a whole seem to more easily adapt and succeed within the mainstream of society (Fordham & Ogbu, 1986, Matute-Bianchi, 1986, Gibson, 1988, Wilson, 1990, Ogbu, 1992). John Ogbu's article, "Adaptation to Minority Status and Impact on School Success" (August, 1992), presents a compilation of these thoughts which, in his opinion, "form the basis of the alternative framework presented here for understanding why some minority groups, such as African Americans have disproportionate and persistent problems in school adjustment and academic performance" (Ogbu, 1992, p. 287). His premise is based on extensive ethnographic research. Findings support the idea that groups that immigrated to this country voluntarily have no "ambivalent-oppositional" feeling toward the dominant culture, trust the schools, see difficulties as temporary surmountable hurdles to be overcome rather than "markers" of difference to be maintained, and have "an educational orientation that strongly endorses academic success as a means of getting ahead in the United States" (Ogbu, 1992, p. 291). In contrast, Ogbu says "one finds in the communities of involuntary minorities, cultural models that make them skeptical of the fact that they can get ahead merely through mainstream beliefs and strategies, even though they verbally endorse education as a means of getting ahead" (p. 291). These groups feel varying degrees of opposition from the dominant culture, distrust the school system, see difficulties as permanent situations instituted by the dominant culture, and point to a history of documented events as proof for their way of thinking. Lastly, it was found that all minority groups have culturally patterned educational strategies that either enhance or inhibit school success. And, although voluntary immigrant groups generally have more strategies than involuntary immigrant groups, according to Ogbu's research, there are members of each group who will be more or less likely to make use of strategies that enhance school success. Further, there will be both successful and unsuccessful members of each group.

Implications of this research include the idea that education and society may have misunderstood the factors most relevant in minority children's lives that impact potential success in school. Instead of just focusing on the schools, the homelife of these children, or some biological characteristic, it is suggested that we include in this mix an examination of historical and structural context of the above mentioned events and experiences to better understand this lack of academic and social success. "To engage in a serious discussion of race in America, we must begin not with the problems of black people but with the flaws of American society - flaws rooted in historic inequalities and longstanding cultural stereotypes (West, 1993, p. 3). "After all, the primary purpose of schooling is to maintain and replenish the culture of an existing social system . . . The first step to reform must be for Americans to accept, and be able to discuss without guilt or blame, that schooling in America is part of a cultural process that sorts by race, class and gender" (Eubanks and Parish, 1993, p. 54). It is suggested we must be able to objectively explore the root causes for our lack of success.

> Education within a pluralistic society should affirm and help students understand their home and community cultures. However, it should also help free them from their cultural boundaries. To create and maintain a civic community that works for the common good, education in a democratic society should help students acquire the knowledge, attitudes, and skills they will need to participate in civic action and to make society more equitable and just" (Banks, 1992, p. 32).

The issue is one of trust, respect, and equality of membership. All individuals want to feel a sense of worth to themselves and to the society within which they live. They want to be afforded the same opportunities as others towards attaining desired goals and objectives. The desire for respect, trust, and equality of membership within the 'collective' is critical for the formulation of images of self-worth and visions of positive and productive life experiences. When a society fails in attempts to instill this type of collective mindset, violence becomes more prevalent, crime rates soar, homeless populations crowd downtown streets and underpasses — the collective becomes angry — take a look around. A society determined to focus on a more moral perspective which values, understands, and better utilizes all of our diverse societal membership will experience the opposite, less violence, lower crime rates, fewer homeless people — a direction desired, if not by all, by most of us. "Believing in a damn good chance makes people feel energized and powerful. Believing in no chance makes people angry, passive, ineffectual. It may also make them violent" (Prothrow-Stith, 1991, p. 57).

> Creating environments conducive to growth, satisfaction, productivity, and effectiveness, if seen as a priority, can be facilitated by individuals, groups, and leaders who understand that tolerance of radical differences is not automatically an evil of contemporary institutions and society but can be a beginning plank in the bridge to a set of strong values that will enable us to span the differences themselves and to reach common ground on the other side. This kind of radical tolerance appears essential if we are to grow together and if we are going to come to greater mutual understanding and appreciation (Thomas and Simpson, 1994).

This issue challenges results of the Melting Pot concept. Although many scholars believe in this premise of assimilation, (like Mortimer Adler, William Bennett, Allan Bloom, E.D. Hirsch, Dwight Murphey, and Diane

Ravitch) actions demonstrate (this concept's attempt at creating a society of the many and the one, the pluribus and the unam) debilitating effects towards minorities, in particular African Americans. Individuals of this subgroup, more often than not, are forced to forget, ignore, or disguise their cultural heritage and concern for equal membership in order to gain partial exceptance and admittance into the societal mainstream. These differences in the way individuals perceive and interact with the environment are considered by some to be threats to the Union. Those most vocal about expressing their anger have historically been labeled malcontent or maladjusted persons. And their efforts declared anti-American, a danger to both our political and educational systems.

Often, proponents seek to have others forget their differences by defining those differences as inferior. They stress the need for unison of thought, unison of purpose, unison of voice, with their thoughts, purpose, and voice being the only one of importance. This view of a collective mindset lacks the level of trust, respect and equality of membership from all its citizenry. It creates an atmosphere of hostility and violence, the type all too prevalent today. The hierarchical structure employs barriers to allow only certain sub-groups varying degrees of access to what is considered the fruits of full citizenship.

> Pseudo-tolerance, or tolerance that is based upon the fallacious idea we must abandon any strongly valued differences, is unlikely to lead to cultural, ethnic, religious, and sexual inclusivism. This quasi-tolerance will result, not in equal respect of persons, social justice, community concern, political freedoms, and substantive distinctions, but in the resurrection of the old cultural and educational melting pot. Radical tolerance will create an environment for a cultural gumbo where every ingredient retains its distance flavor while becoming part of the collective; quasi-tolerance will create an environment where covert and overt ways of eliminating cultural, ethnic, religious, and other differences are employed (Thomas and Simpson, 1994).

Voices traditionally at the bottom of the well seemed to still have some hope of grasping their piece of the 'American Dream.' This seems no longer true today. In fact, even many individuals who once thought they had achieved some degree of success in this endeavor, middle management types, have come to realize how it feels to move backwards (layoff, cutbacks, downsizing, etc.), with little hope of regaining lost ground. You see, the collective is angry. The common ground essential for survival is eroding. Those visions and dreams of prosperity in America are turning into nightmares, nightmares becoming reality in all too many instances. Many individuals perceive a lack of respect, trust, and a high level of alienation within the societal power structure (this being very similar to the thoughts and attitudes of many individuals during the Revolutionary War, American Civil War, Bolshevik Revolution, French Revolution, Great Depression, and the recent demise of the Soviet Union). Historically, African Americans have experienced more barriers than other subgroups. However, due to over a decade of economic instability, voices traditionally infrequently valued in this collective have become extremely proactive towards the attainment of more meaningful input. Considering the demands for more innovation and productivity in today's international marketplace, voices traditionally at the bottom of the well are beginning to attain leverage from which to gain the more meaningful input sought.

There must be an asserted effort to turn many of the negative factors now in operation into positive vehicles for renewed prosperity and strength within our society. When inclusion takes the place of conformity as a focal point for equality, then and only then will a real, positive, and lasting commitment be afforded to all individuals seeking to define and discover the real fruits of life. We begin with strategy designed to promote the concept of embracing diversity. Valuing the ways others interact with the environment will then become a critical element essential for the desired results being sought by all.

> When young people feel that their lives are knit into the fabric of the society at large and when they face the future knowing that a fair share awaits them, they do not form or join violent gangs, although they do form social clubs, fraternities, sororities, and other age-mate groups. Violent gangs arise when young people face a future of limited opportunity and despair, when for military, political, social, or economic reasons the life that awaits a young person has been stripped of meaning and validity (Prothrow-Stith, 1991, pp. 96-97).

It's all in the way we look at things - is it?

References

Akbar, N. (1985). The community of self. Tallahassee, FL: Mind Productions & Associates.

Cose, E. (1993). The Rage of a Privileged Class. New York, NY: HarperCollins Publishers.

Eubanks, E. & Parish, R. (Summer, 1993). After All the Dinosaurs are Gone: A Cultural Requirement for Restructuring? The NABSE Journal, 1(2), 54-61.

Fenstermacher, G. (1990). Some moral considerations on teaching as a profession. In J. Goodlad, R., Soder, K., & Sirotnik (Eds.). The moral dimensions of teaching (pp. 130-151). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Fordham, S., & Ogbu, J. (1986). Black students' school success: Coping with the burden of "acting White. Urban Review, 18(3), 1-31.

Gibson, M. (1988). Accommodation without assimilation: Sikh immigrants in an American high school and community. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Jencks, C. (1972). Inequality. New York: Harper & Row.

Loden, M., & Rosener, J. (1991). Workforce America? Managing employee diversity as a vital resource. Homewood, IL: Business One Irwin Publishers.

Ogbu, J. (Autumn, 1992). Adaptation to Minority Status and Impact on School Success. Theory Into Practice, 31(4), 287-295.

Prothrow-Stith, D. (1991). Deadly Consequences. New York, NY: Harper Collins Publishers.

Thomas, C. & Simpson, D. (In Press). Community and Collegiality in Diverse Settings: A Conflict of Interest in the Professorate? Journal of Negro Education.

Wilson, W. (1985). Cycles of deprivation and the underclass debate. Social Service Review, 59, 541-559.

MEN'S ROLES IN WOMEN'S STUDIES: A CASE IN POINT

Joe L. Green
Louisiana State University in Shreveport

The purpose of this narrative is to recount, with a bit of critical reflection, my experience in teaching a special topics course on "gender issues in curriculum and teaching" at my university during the fall, 1991 term.1 My comments are not offered as an analysis of the course, an evaluation of its outcomes, or, for that matter, even a normative path to be followed, either by others or myself. Rather, it is more accurately a fragment of autobiographical commentary on what might be termed at best a masculine "foray" into feminist teaching, and at worst I suppose, an intrusion into a delicate garden where even masculine angels dare not tread. Whatever the case, I viewed the entire experience rather straightforwardly as a matter of mutual inquiry with some twenty-two graduate students (unfortunately only one of whom was a male) into the nature of the issues set forth in the best known writings of four leading feminist scholars in education. The texts chosen were Carol Gilligan's In a Different Voice, Jane Martin's Reclaiming a Conversation, Nel Noddings's Caring, and Madeleine Grumet's Bitter Milk. My remarks here will be limited to a few discursive notes in response to my experience with the course (EDCI 7920), mainly because a few "syncopated sounds" are all I am capable of making on the subject at this time.

I want to say something about the programmatic context of the course. It was a "special topics" course offered by Louisiana State University for Ph.D. students on the system's Shreveport campus some 225 miles north of Baton Rouge. As an affiliate member of LSU's graduate faculty, I had been teaching courses in curriculum theory (mostly with a strong philosophical slant) regularly on the Shreveport campus since 1989, and had in the course of time developed a contingent of graduate students, including some of my own institution's master's students, who had taken practically all of my graduate courses. In consultation with some of them, I decided to offer a course on "feminist pedagogy" or "gender issues" in education, though I was fully aware of my lack of special training or research background in the area. On the other hand, having developed a growing sensitivity to and sympathy with the feminist movement since the early 1970s, I told my students that I would prefer to fulfill my professorial role more as a moderator and class leader for the course, which we agreed would center on major texts in the field. We had recently invited Madeleine Grumet to the campus for a lecture, which was a part of the university's several but unorchestrated efforts to promote feminist scholarship and, thus, to build a greater awareness of feminist curricular issues. I had been asked to serve on the university's newly formed Committee on Women, having already chaired the College of Education's Committee on Minority Affairs. Thus it was that I was probably the best qualified person in the College of Education to offer such a course, while, at that time, the only faculty member on the Shreveport campus holding joint academic rank with LSU. So, it was either Joe Green, or nothing! I decided to do it.

I must confess that my greatest concern in approaching the course was not my lack of academic qualifications, for I have never been unduly deterred—only occasionally very cautious and discreet—in entering what is, for me at least, a new, if unforbidden, academic thicket. But this, somehow, felt different. It was as if my lack of qualifications to offer such a course was endemic, in the literal, cultural sense of the word. I knew, in purely intellectual terms, that males are not inherently unqualified to do what I was proposing to do. Thus, the following questions were a part of my self-query at the moment of decision: Am I the kind of male who ought to do this? Should someone as I, an old high school basketball coach with the classic burden of "male ego" and all that that suggests, assume such a role? Will the dragon of my old and naive sexism rear its ugly head and mock me in the manner of some Woody Allenesque parody of the important truths I wished to pursue and teach? In short, would I be thought of not only as a pretentious fraud, but would the charges be true? These were a few of the thoughts that raced through my brain at the moment of commitment. I was reminded, once again, that fear takes many forms and that (tritely) it is never a pretty thing!

At the same time I was working through the question of whether to offer my self-proposed course, I was becoming increasingly disgusted with what I considered to be the sleazy assault by academe's right wing on the idea of multicultural education. Without getting into a detailed discussion of this issue and its shallow rhetoric of "political correctness" ("PC", as abbreviated by the William Bennett lap dogs), including such scholars as Arthur Schlesinger, I might say only that I took its essential argument to be both vacuous and mean-spirited, the sort of thing that could be taken as credible only during a period of moral leadership such as we experienced during the 1980s. It could have been the effect of this reactionary movement that provided the final nudge in my thinking that caused me to decide to teach the course, which I billed as "Feminist Issues in Curriculum and Teaching." My decision, I suppose, was on the order of "a statement."

Whatever the causal factors, the course was a totally new adventure for me. I knew that it was something I probably could not have done a decade earlier.

We read Gilligan's book first, but I do not think we did it the justice it deserves. Upon reflection I became convinced that this book should have been re-read at the end of the course, partly for its poetic treasures—in much the same manner that we enjoy a classic movie a second or third time—but also for its depth and insights. In any case, I decided that with twenty-two graduate students (of which at least two-thirds were, as graduate student go, academically talented) it would be fruitful to designate individual students as discussion leaders each week, a plan which would allow maximum freedom for

me to moderate and "schedule" the topics of discussion while also serving as a commentator.

The class met on Thursdays from 5:30 to 8:30. The first two or three evenings were stressful for me and, I think, for some of the students as well, due in part to the fact that the "chemistry" of the class had not quite stabilized. I have learned, after thirty-five years of teaching, that the social formation of a class is always a matter of some importance, no matter what the course or how its members are constituted. However, due in part (no doubt) to my own apprehensions, there was more at stake in the formation or shaping of this particular class than in others I have taught. Its members included a wide range of ages, personalities, educational backgrounds, life experiences, and academic interests. Most were students who had taken previous courses with me. They included a brilliant and talented studio artist (originally from New York), an art therapist, a physical therapist, a young and very conventional farm wife and mother, a former Methodist missionary who had never married and who taught Spanish in a public high school, and at least two active members of the Shreveport Junior League (one was its past-president). There were nine elementary teachers, seven secondary teachers, two school librarians, and two special education teachers. Seven member of the class were black. There was a small sampling of Jewish and Italian backgrounds. The rest were predominantly WASP.

The first evening with its various introductory activities was interesting. Two or three of the students offered jocular descriptions of their personal problems in a world of what they termed "male hegemony over females," one laughing raucously over her divorce. These I knew to be the nervous reactions of serious and capable students. Gradually this sort of behavior abated in favor of a more serious form of discussion and dialogue. The more conventional students were quite threatened, I knew, by the prospect of a course in male bashing. A focus on the serious literature at hand prevented this from happening.

While it was Gilligan's text that got us moving in the right direction, it was Jane Roland Martin's book that allowed us to establish a certain intellectual tone and texture that was never lost. I knew Martin's work only in a general way, having heard her speak occasionally at PES and having noticed her work over a span of years in her earlier books and in other such sources as the PES proceedings, Educational Theory, the Harvard Educational Review, and the 1980 NSSE yearbook. I had been intellectually stimulated and challenged by her distinction between male and female cognitive perspectives (what my friend Jim McClellan mischievously abbreviated as the "CogSpec" issue) and I had followed Harvey Siegel's criticism of Martin's work and her rejoinders to these. But what really made things take shape under the reading of Martin's book was the brilliant discussion leadership of the class's only male student, Neill Normand, who a year earlier had written a term paper in my philosophy of education class on her theory, a paper which I had successfully encouraged him to present at the next meeting of the Louisiana Philosophy of Education Society. Neill knew Martin's work much better than I, and with his wife, Alice, who was also enrolled in the class, caused the discussion of Martin's ideas to be consistently penetrating and, if I may say so, joyful.

I do not think it would be honest to describe our discussion of Nel Noddings's book as joyful; it somehow was harder for students to grasp, causing more of a struggle in their attempt to understand things. I am uncertain why this was the case. Perhaps it was the timing and pacing of the course. After all, as most teachers know, there exists such a stage as "post-median doldrums" in many courses. However, I believe the problem to have been more than this. My feeling is that it was a combination of Noddings's theory and style combined with contextual factors, not the least of which was my own ability to explicate the work. I realized later that I should have had one of my students from an earlier class, Stephania Braselton, visit the class and help us with Noddings. Stephania had written a fine paper on Noddings's theory which she presented in 1991 at our state philosophy of education meeting. But she was encumbered with a required reading course on the same evening as my class, which is probably why she did not take my class in the first place. (I might point out that Noddings's book The Challenge to Care in School, which appeared shortly after this course ended, is a much more accessible text.) In any case, we did the best we could with Caring, then moved on to Madeleine Grumet.

The reading of Grumet's Bitter Milk seemed not to present quite the difficulty as that of Caring, though I am uncertain why this was the case. We spent two evenings discussing Grumet. My class included two students who had seriously read her book during the period of her earlier visit to our campus. It was they who set the tone for our discussions. I was able to offer some clarification of her use of phenomenological method, which is central to understanding her work, and to show some of the methodological distinctions between her approach and that of Noddings. I know now that I would have benefitted exponentially had I had the opportunity to have read Jo Anne Pagano's sensitive essay on Bitter Milk which appeared in Educational Theory shortly after the course ended.

My approach to evaluating students' achievement in the course was to have them develop lengthy essays at mid-term and again at the end of the term. These were something of a compromise between traditional essay examinations and research papers. Each such project involved students' submission of "answers" (or, more accurately, responses) to three very heuristical questions or "situations", the first concerning Gilligan and Martin, the final Noddings and Grumet. In each case the questions were given to the class three weeks in advance of the required submission date. The mid-term compositions were read as carefully and critically as I was able to read such projects, with a maximum responsiveness to each student's work. This lifted the attitude of seriousness about what we were doing; at the same time, an optimum degree of flexibility, autonomy, and leverage was retained by the individual students regarding the expression of ideas.

It was only later that it occurred to me that some form of journal-keeping might have been beneficial to the reflective processes I sought in the course, perhaps some version of the type advocated by Michael Connelly and Jean Clandinin in their book Teachers As Curriculum Planners. I have incorporated the device of journal-keeping in a course I am offering this semester for the second time on "The Ethics of Curriculum and Teaching". I am thus far delighted with this activity, as are my students, from all accounts. I only regret that I did not

incorporate this valuable activity in my teaching at a much earlier date.

My thinking about such masculine forays into feminist teaching remains unsettled. It is surely provocative to speak of my kind of activity in terms of a "foray", since that word is often used in a military vein to mean a "sallying forth" or, as we heard so much of from the television coverage of our nation's recent adventure in Iraq, a sortie. It is a mistake to take the present use of "foray" this sense, although I believe "daring" (sans recklessness, one would hope) is present in its use. Still, no quality of "conquest" is intended, notwithstanding the clear danger of an accusation of "Freudian slip."

My acknowledgement that my thinking about the course remains unsettled is intended to characterize my changing view of the entire experience as I reflect on it from a distance. Throughout the duration of the course and for some time afterwards I held to the view that a male, by virtue of his maleness, is inherently incapable of teaching such a course. By "logical requirements" I refer to what I naively and loosely took to be aspects of the problem of mind, i.e., (a) that one cannot "know" qua female what it means to be female (a kind of gender-solipsism, I suppose) in any society, even one's own society, unless one is female; (b) that feminism is ultimately reducible to understanding the experience of being a woman in some social context; (c) that instruction in feminist courses ought to be honest, i.e., that only women should do this. In short, I was reasoning that being a woman is a necessary, if insufficient, condition for teaching such courses. I knew that, as a male, I could never know the things that Gilligan, Martin, Noddings, and Grumet know, viz., I could not know them in the way they know them. Perhaps I could be said to appreciate them, to know them indirectly or by analogy or through observation, but never "personally" as they do. I was trapped in the mindset of the early Wittgenstein, who disparagingly contended to his most intimate associates that nobody would understand the ideas in the Tractatus unless he had had those same ideas.

As time wore on I came to think this line of reasoning to be altogether convoluted, due mainly to the mistaken categories into which I had compartmentalized such notions as "male/female," "feminism," "teach," "understand," and so forth. I now believe that men have a vital contribution to make to the advancement of any legitimate version of the feminist agenda by means of teaching, whether the curricular structure accommodates the pedagogy and content of that agenda in discrete, special courses (accretion) or in some "across-the-curriculum" approach (permeation). I continue to believe that it would be an impossibility for the aim of feminist education to be achieved by men alone (a notion which is obviously and patently silly), but this is not the same as believing that only women can do this sufficiently. A "feminist" is not necessarily a female; nor are all females feminists. It seems to me, at this stage of my thinking, that the advancement of the feminist agenda can be most fruitfully accomplished if both men and women participate actively toward that end, but that the kind of experience most foundational to any viable curriculum and pedagogy must be that of women.

NOTES

[1] An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Twenty-fourth Annual Meeting of the American Educational Studies Association at the University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, on November 7, 1992. It was one of three papers offered as a symposium titled "Masculine Forays into Feminist Pedagogy." I chaired the symposium. My earlier draft was titled "Building a Course in Gender Issues in Education: Autobiographical Notes." Other papers were presented by Professors Emanuel I. Shargel of Florida State University and James Garrison of Virginia Polytechnic University. Professor Wendy Kohli of the State University of New York at Binghamton was our respondent.

SOMEWHAT LESS THAN PERFECT: CARL SCHURZ'S POLICIES AND THE INDIAN SCHOOLS

Karen McKellips
Cameron University

Following the Civil War, reconstruction of the South engaged the attention of the country. The debate among various groups regarding the proper position of the freedmen in the country's future included how best to use schooling to direct the African-American to his/her proper place in American society. At this same time another group, whose situation also was changing as a result of the outcome of war, found itself the subject of debate regarding what form of schooling would best mold them to fit into their proper place in American society.

The last of the Indian Wars were fought with a hostility little short of ethnic cleansing. The sentiment, "the only good Indian is a dead Indian," a statement attributed to General Philip Sheridan,[1] seemed to guide the soldiers whose targets included non-combatant women, children, and the elderly. Once disarmed, the survivors often found themselves stripped of everything they owned except what they could carry on their backs, their tipis and household goods burned, and their livestock shot.

In the quarter-century following the Civil War, the last of the major free American Indian groups, the Navajo, Nez Perce, Cheyenne, Arapaho, Kiowa, Utes, Comanche, Lakota, Apache, and others surrendered to the federal government. Impoverished, starving, and sick, the remnants of once great nations were herded onto reservations distant from their former lands where little game was available and the foods that they had traditionally gathered were missing. Thus they were dependent upon handouts of blankets, beef, and other annuities guaranteed, but never delivered in the quantities or qualities promised, by treaties with the government of the United States. The plight of these people came to the attention of Americans in the eastern United States through the efforts of missionaries and members of the press.

When the Bureau of Indian Affairs was established in 1824, it was a division of the War Department. It was moved from that agency to the Interior Department when it was created in 1849, a move that was appropriate as Native Americans were moving toward extinction as was the buffalo and the unbroken prairie. During the Indian Wars of the last quarter of the nineteenth century, attempts were made, encouraged by such military leaders as Sheridan and Sherman, to return Indian affairs to the War Department. However, for even some military leaders, the sentiment that "the only good Indian is a dead Indian," was giving way to Richard Henry Pratt's philosophy of, "Kill the Indian but save the man."

Carl Schurz's tenure as Secretary of the Interior came in the midst of a period of instability in Indian policy at least partly arising from constant change in leadership. Between 1865 and 1887, there were ten Secretaries of the Interior, twelve Commissioners of Indian Affairs, thirteen Secretaries of War, and three Commanding Generals of the Army, all of whom had some measure of control in the conduct of Indian affairs.

As it had periodically since the seventeenth century, public opinion in areas in which there was little direct confrontation between Native Americans and white settlers, miners, etc., held that the solution to the "Indian problem" would be found in education and Christian conversion. However, a third element was engendering controversy at this time. Was assimilation best accomplished through the reservation system or through separating native people from each other and scattering them throughout society? The latter theory included programs to educate American Indian students away from their reservations and plans to divide reservation lands, giving each American Indian a few acres. These plots were to be scattered among land to be occupied by white homesteaders. The policy of destroying American Indian cultures in this manner rather than through genocide is known as "Grant's Peace Policy" since it was developed during the presidency of Ulysses S. Grant.

Carl Schurz had been one of the German immigrants known as the *Forty-Eighters* as a result of having come to the United States with the collapse of the German Revolution of 1848. In The Americanization of Carl Schurz, Chester Easum says Schurz was "extremely critical of fellow Germans for 'clannishness,' the slowness with which many Americanized, and their tendency to act as Germans rather than as American citizens."[2]

His Americanization included rapidly becoming involved in American politics, being nominated for lieutenant governor of Wisconsin even before he had been in the country long enough to serve. He worked tirelessly for Lincoln and other Republican candidates, traveling twenty-one thousand miles in the campaign. Upon Lincoln's election he supported him in such varied roles as playing the piano for him in the White House to soothe his violent headaches, serving as ambassador to Spain, recruiting German immigrants for the army, and serving as a general at Gettysburg and Chancellorsville.

During Andrew Johnson's presidency, he undertook an investigatory tour throughout the South at Johnson's request, but his official report and statements made to the newspapers were so critical of Johnson's policy that he spent that administration working as a newspaperman. One area of disagreement involved educational policy relating to the freedmen. He saw the problem of African-American suffrage and African-American education as a *chicken or egg* problem. He feared that southern legislatures would not allow freedmen to vote until they were educated, but that they would not be provided schools until they had the vote.[3]

Schurz campaigned for Grant and was elected Senator from Missouri in 1868. A leader of the Liberal Republicans, Schurz took Civil Service Reform as his cause, and he and Grant became irreconcilable enemies. The break with Grant was complete when Schurz was elected president of the Liberal Republican convention which nominated Horace Greeley for President, a choice also made by the Democrats. Defeated for re-election, Schurz again earned his living as a newspaperman and

105

touring speaker. In the election of 1876, he campaigned for Rutherford B. Hayes and became Secretary of the Interior.

His friendship and rapport with Hayes was the closest he had had with any President since Lincoln with Schurz again entertaining at the White House piano. Hayes and Schurz agreed upon the importance of education in assimilating minorities, and both advocated free public education. Hayes served as a trustee of the Peabody Education Fund and was president of the Slater Fund for Negro Education from 1882 until 1893. W.E.B. DuBois credited him with arranging his scholarship from the fund.[4]

Schurz had hoped for secretary of state or treasury admitting he had never paid much attention to the Indian problem, patents, pensions, and public lands. According to his biographer Claude Fuess, the Interior Department was a "dumping ground for odds and ends" requiring a "Pooh Bah, a specialist on all topics in the encyclopedia" as an administrator.[5] Responsible for public lands, government pensioners, land-grant railroads, charitable institutions in Washington D.C., the census, the land offices, and a dozen other bureaus, Indian affairs and public lands would receive most of his attention during his ten hour days at his office desk.[6] He has been called the original "conservationist" for his attempts to protect national forests from loggers and miners.[7] He announced that timber thieves were "not merely stealing trees but stealing whole forests."[8]

To assess the Indian situation for himself, in 1879 Schurz spent six weeks touring several Indian reservations with a group which included President Hayes' son and several newspaper correspondents. A similar trip was made in 1880.

In 1869 all but two employees of the Indian service were military men. Public pressure resulting from massacres of unarmed non-combatants such as the 1870 Piegan incident in Montana where 158 of 173 of the Piegans killed were elderly men, women, and children, fifty of them children under twelve, resulted in replacing military men with missionaries.[9]

As Hayes' Secretary of the Interior, Carl Schurz was in a position to shape policy and direct government action regarding the fate of American Indian people. The treaties executed under the Grant Peace Policy included provisions for supplying teachers and funds for education. Debate began regarding what sort of schools should be provided and where they should be located. Richard Henry Pratt, guard, jailer, and tutor in adapting to white ways for prisoners of war taken from Ft. Sill, Indian Territory, to Ft. Marion, Florida, proposed establishing an American Indian boarding school. Until the school could be built, he suggested enrolling American Indians at Hampton Institute, the school for freedmen. Toward this goal, he contacted Secretary of the Interior Schurz. Schurz acquiesced, and a separate building at Hampton was to be used for the education of Indian students. Pratt objected to this segregation, writing to Schurz suggesting that had he been confined to associating only with other German immigrants when he came to the United States, he could hardly have risen to prominence as he had.[10]

By 1872, thirteen Christian denominations were supplying Indian agents to the seventy-three Indian agencies.[11] Most of the missionaries supported the building of schools on reservations where children could attend day school until about the age of twelve at which time they would go to on-reservation boarding schools for industrial training. Others, including such military advisors as Pratt and General Robert H. Milroy, recommended to Schurz removing Indian children from their families and cultures as early as possible and educating them in off-reservation government boarding schools. Schurz opposed church control of Indian policy and when he became Secretary of the Interior, he took the advice of these people.[12]

In keeping with his reputation as a civil service reformer, in 1877 Schurz sent Indian Commissioner John Q. Smith to investigate the Indian agencies. Schurz's displeasure with Smith's work resulted in his retirement and the appointment of an investigating board. When the board found widespread corruption and fraud, Schurz dismissed thirty-five of seventy-four agents. He remarked that a competent, honest Indian agent was a "rare jewel."[13]

Despite his attempts at reform, there was pressure by many within the army and those opposed to the entanglement of church and state to either return Indian affairs to the War Department or create a separate agency. In an interview in the Washington Post, General Nelson Miles stated that there would be less fraud under the War Department than under Interior. An exchange of letters between Miles and Schurz, with Schurz arguing that he had, and would continue to, improve treatment of the Indians and eliminate corruption in the Indian Service.[14]

A Congressional investigation was held with an appearance before the committee of Chief Joseph of the Nez Perce and a letter from Sitting Bull who had sought asylum in Canada protesting that control by the War Department would mean extermination of the Indians. The Congressional committee vote to return Indian affairs to the War Department split four to four along party lines, the House defeated the measure, and the Bureau remained in the Interior Department.[15]

Also, the Catholic Church was complaining that although they had been first to minister to many Indian groups, Protestants had been favored in awarding agencies. The Nation's editor said Grant, "might almost as well have handed over the management of the Treasury to the Bible Society and called on the Board of Foreign Missions to conduct the Post Office."[16] Schurz opened all reservations to all denominations.

By the time he wrote his first annual report in November 1877, Schurz had determined to take the advice of those who saw the solution of the "Indian problem" to be the isolation of Indian tribes on a few reservations from which whites not employed by the Indian Service would be barred and removing children from their families to boarding schools as early as age eight. During his tenure at the Interior Department, in addition to approving the sending of Indian students to Hampton Institute and the establishing of Carlisle, an Indian industrial school was established at Forest Grove, Oregon, to serve northern tribal groups. Thus was begun what became in later years, an extensive network of Bureau of Indian Affairs' off-reservation boarding schools. Alonzo Bell, Assistant Secretary under Schurz's successor wrote to Schurz that Indian policy remained "substantially yours."[17]

Most "friends of the Indians," individuals and groups committed to aiding and "civilizing" American Indians,

approved of Schurz's plans for Indian education and his fight against corruption in the Indian Service. Had he not become embroiled in controversy regarding the forcing of Indians onto unsuitable reservations to which they did not wish to move, he would most likely have been viewed as a true friend to the Indian. However because of removal tactics which caused much suffering and death he lost the support of most of those working to aid the Indians. At the beginning of his term as Secretary, he backed the policy in place during the previous administration and supported the use of force to move reluctant Indian groups to distant reservations. Chief Joseph's Nez Perce, the Northern Cheyenne, the Bannocks, the Utes, and the Apache all were moved under terrible conditions during Schurz's tenure at the Interior Department. However it was the plight of the Poncas resulting from this policy which became a *cause celebre* for "friends of the Indians" nationwide.

In violation of a treaty, 710 Poncas, a peaceful tribe, well on their way to full assimilation into white culture, were ordered to move from their Dakota and Nebraska homeland to Indian Territory (present Oklahoma.) Their farm equipment and household goods were taken from them, and they were "escorted" by the army to Indian Territory and placed on a small reservation of unproductive land without the proper equipment to farm it or the necessary annuities to sustain them through the winter. Even their army escorts protested against being involved in the matter. Soon there were only 430 of them left alive.[18]

Chief Standing Bear and his band left the reservation and returned to Nebraska. Schurz had them arrested and "friends of the Indians" rallied to support Standing Bear. Prominent Nebraska attorneys took his case, and local white sentiment was in his favor as the land which had been taken from the assimilated Ponca had been given to the unassimilated Lakota.

In this precedent-setting 1879 case, the government lost as the judge ruled that since the Poncas had renounced tribal authority and assimilated into white society, they had the right to live wherever they pleased. In a separate ruling in 1881, the Poncas were allowed to choose to live either in Indian Territory or in Nebraska. Some chose to return to Nebraska; some stayed in Indian Territory.[19]

Among those supporting Standing Bear was Helen Hunt Jackson—the writer later to achieve fame for her romance novel, Ramona. This friend of Emily Dickinson, who had experimented with spiritualism and clairvoyance with Nathaniel Hawthorne and Horace Greeley, was outraged at the myriad of cruel, illegal treaty violations by the government. She wrote A Century of Dishonor, an emotional, didactic, yet essentially true, exposure of the mistreatment of the Poncas and eleven other tribes and sent every member of the 1880 Congress a copy. In it she castigated Schurz soundly for his role in the Ponca matter calling him a "blockhead."[20] Jackson and Schurz exchanged a series of letters which were published in the New York Tribune and The Boston Daily Advertiser. Other major newspapers editorialized on one side or the other of the battle. Theodore Roosevelt said Jackson's book would appeal to "maudlin fanatics."[21]

Standing Bear, a part-Indian woman named Bright Eyes, and her fiance, Thomas Tibbles, a former member of John Brown's abolitionist group, toured the country speaking to large audiences. At these appearances letters were read from such people as Edward Everett Hale, Henry Dawes, and Wendell Phillips (who later wrote his own book criticizing government Indian policy) pleading for contributions to help Indians pursue cases in the courts. Although he later admitted that the Indians should have had reservations on their original lands instead of being forced to migrate to reservations that were chosen because at the time the white man did not want the land, he claimed that Congress was to blame. Still, he was never viewed by most of those working for Indian rights as a true "friend of the Indian."

In defending his Indian policy, Schurz's statements of early successes were, to say the least, exaggerated. His statement that he had "patiently, earnestly, and laboriously studied the Indian problem, day after day [watching] over the rights and interests of those helpless people as much as any one in his position before" was probably true.[22] However, the facts do not support his claim that "the popular impression that Indian outbreaks were generally caused by the villainy of Government agents, who defrauded and starved the Indians is substantially unfounded."[23] The impression was often well-founded.

One wonders if Schurz himself believed what he wrote in explaining his faith that not only would boarding school education result in full assimilation but that by 1880 American Indian people were eager for assimilation. He wrote that

> since the whites are crowding on all sides round their reservations, and the Indians want to become like them. . . Even most of all the old-fogey chiefs, who have clung most tenaciously to their traditional customs, very earnestly desire their children to receive that education. . . It is no longer to be apprehended that [they] will relapse into savage life.[24]

His 1880 statement that already his government Indian boarding schools had resulted in "thousands of Indians a short time ago vagrant and idle now earning wages running into hundreds of thousands of dollars. . . multitudes. . . a few years since on the warpath now building houses and cultivating their farms. . . asking for the white man's title to their lands" was untrue.[25] Nor did all Indian students at Carlisle "submit cheerfully to the discipline imposed upon them,"[26] as he said. In spite of these claims of success, he opposed granting Indians citizenship saying that "they would not know what to do with it if they had it.[27] We must in a great measure do their thinking for them, and then in the most humane way possible induce them to accept our conclusions,"[28] he wrote.

Although Schurz was frequently seen as embodying some of the worst characteristics of assimilationists, he was not in favor of eliminating or excluding those of any race from the country. He opposed the limiting of oriental immigration and hoped for their assimilation along with Native Americans and the freedmen. He crusaded against anti-Semitism. A featured speaker at a dinner honoring Herbert Spencer, Schurz was a Social Darwinist who believed the proper education and association with those he saw as of a superior culture would cause the brightest and best of other cultures to lead their people into assimilation. As a result there were those

from minority groups who never wavered in their support for him. Booker T. Washington, teaching at Hampton at the time of Schurz's 1880 visit there, described him as "lift[ing] himself out of the poisoned atmosphere of racial as well as sectional prejudices"[29] and later delivered an eulogy at Schurz's funeral.

With the end of the Hayes administration, Schurz's direct involvement with Indian affairs and Indian schools ended. He wrote and spoke occasionally about Indian matters during the remainder of his life as he worked primarily as a writer and public speaker after he left public service. The reliance on Indian schools and the settling of Indians on their own individual plots of land as techniques for assimilation continued as government policy for many years to come.

Schurz did not see value in the preservation of Indian culture or language. He was convinced that the solution to the "Indian problem" was the education of Indian children away from their families and what he called their "savage home surroundings."[30] This education was best provided in industrial boarding schools where they would speak only English and have no opportunity to participate in American Indian ceremonies or wear traditional dress. To minimize reversion to tribal ways upon their return, tribal lands should be broken into individual small plots deeded to individuals and tribal governments should be abolished. They would then become indistinguishable from their European-American neighbors except for the color of their skins. Eventually their nations should cease to exist, and they would become full citizens of the United States.[31]

Soon his ideas were embraced by most who considered themselves "friends of the Indians." The Supreme Court (in its rulings dissolving tribal governments, for example), most members of Congress, the executive branch of the government, and national associations devoted to helping the Indians were soon endorsing his views. As Edward Spicer has written, ". . . it was clearly an expression of the unity of view in the Western world at this time concerning the right of powerful nations to dominate others politically and culturally."[32] Government policy regarding American Indians had become a sort of amalgamation of "manifest destiny" and imperialism.

Schurz's first biographers, writing in 1908, assessed his contribution as follows:

> [Schurz's] annual report for 1879 outlines every feature of the policy which was destined to achieve such signal success in the breakup of tribal life during the ensuing quarter century. The education of Indian youths was one prime element in this policy, to the end of introducing 'civilized ideas, wants and aspirations,' and the influence of Mr. Schurz was decisive in putting Indian education on a firm foundation. He co-operated [sic] in the original experiment with Indian pupils at Hampton. . . gave the deciding word for the establishment of . . . Carlisle. . . sustained the institution. . . as well as other similar enterprises. . . declared that these experiences had already passed the stage of experimental, and were, as agencies for promoting the civilization of Indians, highly successful.[33]

While he spoke of the value of competency in several languages, it was European languages that Schurz valued. He taught German to the woman with whom he appears to have been in love after the death of his wife so that they could exchange letters in that language. He would say,

> I have always been in favor of a sensible Americanization. . . but this need not mean a complete abandonment of all that is German. . . The German mother tongue, the dear, strong, noble, tender, sacred mother tongue—may it live everlastingly here and all the world over![34]

In 1879, during Schurz's tenure at Interior, two missionary societies were threatened with the loss of federal support if they did not cease academic instruction in and the use of Bibles written in Indian languages.[35]

He belonged to German-American societies, preferred German classical and semi-classical music, and aided his wife in establishing kindergartens in Wisconsin and later in the public school in St. Louis during the superintendency of William T. Harris. "Those who would meanly and coldly forget their own mother could not be expected to be faithful to their young bride," he said.[36]

Yet he did not support the blending of Native American culture with European-American, nor did those who would follow him in setting policy in the many Bureau of Indian Affairs' schools to which by 1930, fifty thousand Indian students were taken, some against the will of their parents. Perhaps that is why such schools were, in the words of Schurz's biographer, Hans Trefousse, "somewhat less than perfect."[37]

NOTES

1. The Almanac of American History, Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., et al, eds., (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1983), p. 313

2. Chester Verne Easum, The Americanization of Carl Schurz (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929), p. 138.

3. Joseph Schaefer, Carl Schurz Militant Liberal (Evansville, Wisconsin: The Antes Press, 1930), p. 167.

4. Philip Weeks, "From War to Peace: Rutherford B. Hayes and the Administration of Indian Affairs 1877-1881," The Old Northwest 11 (1985-86): 165.

5. Claude Moore Fuess, Carl Schurz Reformer (New York: Dodd, Meade & Company, 1932), p. 252.

6. Ibid., p. 256.

7. Ibid., p. 267.

8. Quoted in Philip Shabecoff, "To Heal a Wounded Land," Constitution 5 (Spring-Summer 1993): 40.

9. Robert Winston Mardock, The Reformers and the American Indian (Columbia, Missouri: University of Missouri Press, 1971), pp. 63-75.

10. Elaine Goodale Eastman, Pratt, The Red Man's Moses, (Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1935), pp. 214-215.

11. Mardock, p. 82.

12. Hans. L. Trefousse, "Carl Schurz and the Indians," Great Plains Quarterly 4 (Spring 1984): 111.

13. Weeks, p. 13.

14. Mardock, p. 164.

15. Ibid., p. 166.

16. Ibid., p. 163.

17. Fuess, p. 266.

18. Weeks, p. 166.

19. Donald R. Hickey,—"The Trial of Standing Bear," Constitution 3 (Spring 1991): 62-63.

20. Helen Hunt Jackson, A Century of Dishonor, with an Introduction by Andrew F. Rolle, Torchbook edition, (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), p. xi. A Century of Dishonor was originally published in 1881 by Harper Brothers.

21. Ibid., p. xvi.

22. Carl Schurz, Speeches, Correspondence and Political Papers of Carl Schurz, Vol. IV, Frederic Bancroft, ed., (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1939), p. 76.

23. Ibid., p. 117.

24. Ibid., p. 135.

25. Ibid., p. 77.

26. Ibid., p. 133.

27. Ibid., p. 125.

28. Ibid., p. 140.

29. Fuess, p. 264.

30. Schurz, p. 131.

31. A succinct presentation of Schurz's views and plans is found in his "Present Aspects of the Indian Problem," which is found in Americanizing the American Indian: Writings by the 'Friends of the Indian' 1880-1900, edited by Francis Paul Prucha (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973), pp. 13-26.

32. Edward H. Spicer, A Short History of the Indians of the United States, Reprint Edition (Malabar, Florida: Robert E. Krieger Publishing Company, 1983), p. 98.

33. Schurz, Carl, The Reminiscences of Carl Schurz, Volume III, 1863-1869, With a Sketch of His Life and Public Services from 1869-1906 (New York: The McClure Company, 1908), p. 386. The portion covering 1869-1906 written by Frederic Bancroft and William A. Dunning.

34. Fuess, p. 333.

35. Evelyn C. Adams, American Indian Education, (Morningside Heights, NY: King's Crown Press, 1946), p. 50-51.

36. Hans L. Trefousse, Carl Schurz, A Biography, (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1982), p. vii.

37. Ibid., p. 116.

THE BIOGRAPHY OF A RADICAL CHINESE FEMINIST AND REVOLUTIONARY (1875-1907)

Timothy J. Bergen, Jr.
University of South Carolina

Because of long held ethical norms within the Confucian tradition, the position and rights of Chinese women have suffered since ancient times. With few exceptions, such as with Wu Tse-tien, the empress of the Tang dynasty (618-907 A.D.), most women in China were not able to attain any significant social or political status without assistance from their male partners. It seems arbitrary to assert that no feminist movement rose in China to protect women's rights before modern times, but it is only fair to point out that no such movement arose in the West either prior to the twentieth century. In the early twentieth century an outstanding woman revolutionary, Chiu Chin rose up as a champion who tried not only to liberate Chinese women from the bondage of male-dominated society but to overthrow the Manchu dynasty. She deserves a careful study on the grounds that her colorful but tragic life epitomizes a devotion to feminist movements as well as nationalist revolution.

In modern China two revolutions attracted historians' special attention, the 1911 revolution and the 1949 revolution. The former established the Republic of China (Taiwan), while the latter brought about the People's Republic of China (Mainland China). The political hostility between the two China's since 1949 does not diminish the significance of the 1911 revolution which is celebrated by both sides. Prior to the 1911 revolution sporadic local revolts occurred in which the linking riot led by Hsu Hsi-liu in the name of Kuang-fu Hui was influential because their anti-Manchu activities awakened the multitude of people in the lower Yangtze river areas to help overthrow the Manchu regime.[1] A native of Chekiang, Chiu Chin was devoted to the 1911 revolution. She died as a martyr and is today honored by both the Taiwanese and the Chinese alike.

In this essay I will delineate the life of Chiu Chin and examine the views of those scholars who have contributed studies to the heroine. In my opinion, Chiu Chin was a radical feminist and national revolutionary who was highly influenced by traditional Chinese thought. Although she had only a limited understanding of Western Culture, with a hot temper, she plunged into the conflict between her resentment over the weakness of the motherland and her active pursuit of national salvation. Her sacrifice was for the liberation of Chinese women and the 1911 revolution.

Studies of Chiu Chin

Chiu Chin was studied in the West mainly not because of her revolutionary deeds but because of her feminist position and her radical intellectual stand. Florence Ayscough, who wrote Chinese Women Yesterday and Today,[2] in 1956, was one of the earlier scholars to admire Chiu Chin's talents and charisma. Helen Foster Snow's Women in Modern China,[3] published in 1967, places Chiu Chin in her relationship with the Kuomintang. Mary Backus Rankin was perhaps the most important scholar of Chiu Chin studies. Rankin's Early Chinese Revolutionaries: Radical Intellectuals in Shanghai and Chekiang, 1902-1911,[4] published in 1971, emphasizes Chiu Chin's role in the riot in the Chekiang area. She also published "The Emergence of Women at the End of the Ching: The Case of Chiu Chin," in Women in Chinese Society,[5] edited by Margery Wolf and Roxane Witke in 1975. In the article, Rankin stresses Chiu Chin's importance and accomplishments in the feminist movement. Jonathan Spence pays attention to Chiu Chin's nationalism and feminism, relating them to the cultural and literary developments of the time in his The Gate of Heavenly Peace,[6] published in 1981.

Based on the Ching government legal file of the Chiu Chin Case, Chiu Tsan-chih, Chiu Chin's daughter, published Chiu Chin Ko-ming Chuan[7] in 1952, which is by far the most detailed biography covering the various aspects of Chiu Chin's life. The Kuomintang Central Women's Working Committee sponsored the publication of a woman writer, Meng Tao, who wrote Chien-hu Nu-hsia Chiu Chin in 1957.[8] According to the chairman of that committee, Meng's work was published in order to increase Chinese youth's understanding of the nationalist revolution. Yu Chao-yi's Chiu Chin published in Hong Kong in 1956, relates Chiu Chin's feminist efforts and revolutionary activities. Tan Jen's four act revolutionary historical play, "Chiu Chin," received an award from the Chinese Youth Anti-Communist Corps in Taiwan in 1965, and portrayed Chiu Chin's role in the anti-Manchu movement and the 1911 Revolution.

In the People's Republic of China, during the early 1980's, many sources on the 1911 Revolution were published because of the Chinese Communist Party's policy of examining the 1911 Revolution and the history of the Republic of China. Sun Yuan-chao's Hsin-hai ko-ming su lieh-shih nien-pu,[10] published in 1981, includes biographical annals of Chiu Chin. Chiu Chin's life and revolutionary episodes were carefully studied. Kuo Yen-li studied Chiu Chin's poems and essays. Kuo's Chiu Chin shih wen hsuan[11] published in 1982, reviews Chiu Chin's literary achievements. Liu Yu-lai's Chiu Chin Shih tzu chu-shih[12] published in 1983, provides notes and interpretations of Chiu Chin's poems and verse, and regards Chiu Chin as a vanguard of national liberation and woman's liberation. A Marxist feminist, Lin Yin[13] wrote "Chin kuo ying-hsiung Chiu Chin," which appeared in Hsin-hai ko ming shih-chi ti li-shih jen-wu, and concentrates on Chiu Chin's opposition to the traditional value system. Lin Yin probes the relationship between Chiu Chin's family members, charging that the origin of Chiu Chin's feminism stems from her opposition to gender inequality and patriarchy.

Early Years and Marriage

Chiu Chin was born on November 8, 1875 in Sanyin, near Shaohsing in Chekiang province. She was the youngest child in an official family and was educated in Confucian classics. Her parents inculcated in her a love of literature and she wrote poetry in a grand manner. She read enthusiastically the patriotic poets Tu Fu and Hshin Chi-chi and admired such heroines as Shen Yun-ying, Chin Liang-yu,[14] Sofya Perovskaya, and Catherine Beecher. In the highly conservative society of China, few girls were inclined to study the martial arts, but Chiu Chin was an exception. At sixteen she learned to ride horses and duel with swords as well.

These early years witnessed the background of Chiu Chin's prospective mental development. Her indulgence in Confucian teachings, traditional novels, and historical studies along with family education would equip her later as a competent intellectual. Like many nationalists of the time she was quite xenophobic in her outlook. It is believed that Chiu Chin's grandfather worked in Amoy, which after the Opium War was open to British trade. According to a Marxist writer, Hsu Shuang-yun, some of the British missionaries intruded into her grandfather's office in such an unreasonable way that it incited the old man's anger and probably helped strengthen Chiu Chin's anti-imperialist attitude.[15]

Jonathan Spence reveals that Chiu Chin, like Kang Yu-wei, did not rely on the Western models for her revolutionary attitude.[16] I agree with this view because many reasons account for Chiu Chin's disinclination toward westernization. At the turn of the century, Western ideas were coming into China through foreign missionaries, newspapers, and such translators as Yen Fu and Lin Chin-nan. The Chinese people felt a strong external impact not only from the experience of China's humiliation in the Opium War and the unequal treaties subsequently signed but also from Japan's successful reforms and national expansion.

Under these circumstances Chiu Chin's response to the Western ideas was complicated. Her attitude toward the Western world was that of envy which was expressed explicitly in one of her songs thus:

> They enjoy freedom, prosperity, and peace. They live happily year after year. Their national life is millennial. Commerce, developed; military strong; industry and technology grew progressively. Political situation and scholarship are perfect.[17]

In speaking of China, Chiu Chin's tone becomes melancholic:

> I am resentful that my country is by far more miserable than the Western nations. I am regretful that China, who had enjoyed a glorious past, has now become desperate. The nature of my people was originally not bad. Why could not they achieve higher accomplishments than the white people.[18]

Like the majority of the Chinese students in Japan, she saw how the Japanese Army defeated the aggressive Russians for which Chiu Chin wrote a poem praising the Japanese victory "over the powerful, devious, and absolutely untrustworthy Russians.[19] Chiu Chin's nationalism is a mixture of resentment of China's weakness and an admiration of a charismatic Japan. Chiu Chin's indifference to Western models was based on her limitations in understanding Western culture. She urged her brother to study abroad and wrote him a letter, saying, "in dealing with practical matters in today's world, it is necessary to understand Western studies," and added, "if you can study abroad for a couple of years, it will be easier for you to obtain a job."[20] In her eyes, the trend of world affairs went favorably to the Western nations, but her knowledge, obtained from traditional education, drew her away from any idea of "total westernization". In other words, her nationalism overcame her proclivity toward western values which is evident in a letter of her friend:

> Although you have attended school, your Chinese must be excellent. It is unwise to give up Chinese and overwhelmingly concentrate on learning English. Everybody must have a sense of patriotism. Without knowing national literature and history it is impossible to incite patriotism.[21]

At twenty-two Chiu Chin was married by family arrangement to Wang Ting-chun, a man of a wealthy merchant family in Hunan. After Wang purchased an official post in the Manchu capital, she accompanied him to Beijing. She did not, however, like her husband and his way of living there. The marriage was doomed to be tragic basically because of their conflict in philosophy and attitude toward political problems. Chiu Chin was a liberal, trying to reform society, while Wang was a conservative who was satisfied with the status quo.

Mary B. Rankin, Helen F. Snow, and Lin Yin, are sympathetic to Chiu Chin. They agree with Chiu Chin's accusation of her husband as a man of irresponsibility, no better than an animal.[22] The interesting point however, is that Meng Yao, describes Chiu Chin's husband as a "considerate and affectionate gentleman".[23] One possible explanation for Meng Yao's sympathy is that her publication was sponsored by the Republic of China government whose pro-Confucianism emphasizes harmony between husband and wife. Doubtlessly, Chiu Chin was an ardent feminist both in action and speech. A major portion of her literary works shows her concern for woman's social status and basic rights. In 1907 she started the Chinese Woman's Journal to rally to that purpose. In the first issue she said:

We want to unite our two hundred million sisters to be a solid whole, so that they can call to each other. Our journal will act as a mouthpiece for our women. It is meant to help our sisters by giving their life a deeper meaning and hope to advance rapidly towards a bright, new society. We Chinese women should become the vanguard in rousing the people to welcome enlightment.[24]

In addition to encouraging reasonable divorces, she was strongly opposed to foot-binding, arranged marriage, and gender discrimination. In Chiu Chin's opinion, gender equality may be achieved through a woman's independence. She felt that "women must have a good education and be independent," and asserted that women "must not rely upon men," and "for the purpose of gender equality, the revolution must start from the family."[25]

Although Chinese Marxists have different views of

Chiu Chin, their attitude toward her is generally positive. During the Yenan period in the 1930's and 1940's, the women communists were interested in the female role in the modern world. They compared Chiu Chin with Nora, an ideal feminist in one of Henrik Ibsen's (1828-1906) plays, relating that the similarity between the two lies in their bold action to give up family, son, and daughter, for the uncertain future of revolutionary activism. Lin Yin emphasizes Chiu Chin's efforts to escape the bondage of the "feudal" family system, pointing out that her mother was mistreated by her father and that all her sisters were unable to live on an equal basis with their counterparts. It is problematic to label the society in which Chiu Chin lived as "feudal," moreover, the theory of class struggle seems irrelevant to interpret the conflict between the sexes. On the other hand, Chiu Chin was neither a leftist nor a socialist, and her attitude toward the working class was not necessarily sympathetic. Judging from this yardstick, it is hard to place Chiu Chin on the line of proletarian revolutionaries.

Japan and the Abortive Riot

Determined to be educated and carry out her ideas, Chiu Chin went to Tokyo in the summer of 1904. She intended to study political science and within three months she acquired a good knowledge of the Japanese language. In Yokohama she joined the secret society, the Triad, making friends with such leading nationalist revolutionaries, as Tao Cheng-chang and Huang Hsing.

In December of 1905, the Japanese Ministry of Education enacted a new law to limit Chinese students' revolutionary activities. This policy elicited vehement protests from Chinese students, who were divided into two wings. One wing claimed that the Chinese students should stop their studies immediately and return to China. The other wing felt that they had no choice but to follow Japanese law and continue with their studies. Chiu Chin belonged to the first group. According to an account, while facing these two groups of students, Chiu Chin took out her Japanese sword and declared in her speech: "I will use this sword to kill any one who, after returning to our motherland, surrenders to the Manchus and betrays us Han Chinese."[26]

At that time, Lu Shun, (1881-1936) who later became China's most acclaimed writer of the twentieth century, was among the audience but did not endorse Chiu Chin's attitude nor her way of carrying out a revolution. Lu Shun regarded her along with Sun Yat-sen, as being unable to bring constructive change to the country. Lu Shun did not participate in Tung-meng Hui, because he rejected violence as a revolutionary measure. Unlike Lu Shun, Chiu Chin took part in the organization and was elected a representative responsible for setting up a branch in her native province. Chiu Chin's devotion to violent revolution was unquestioned.

The Doctrine of the Mean has long been a part of Chinese philosophy. Before Chiu Chin, such reformers as Kang Yu-wei and Liang Chi-chao accepted constitutional monarchy instead of employing violence to overthrow the Manchus. In this connection a question arises: Why did Chiu Chin become so radical in her attitude toward reform and revolution? To this question Spence's[27] view is that Chiu Chin, like many nationalists of the day, chose radicalism because gradualism might enable the Manchus to re-establish their position. This reflects one side of the coin. On the other side, Chiu Chin's personal character was an important factor. As a hot-tempered person, she was spoiled by her parents from childhood. Her trip to Japan was a turning point which turned her character and thought in a more drastic direction. In Japan she was influenced by nihilism, and she admired Japanese militarymen and their prowess. In one of her poems she highly praises the Meiji emperor's sagacity and the Japanese victory over the Russians. The success of the Meiji Restoration provided a successful paradigm for her motherland, making her look forward to seeing the advent of a strong China. On the other hand, her radicalism was related to her male-oriented proclivity. In one of her poems, she writes, "although I am not a man, my mind is more drastic than any one of men."[28] She had fostered a sense of martyrdom in her thought, paying her homage to such patriots as Yo Fei, Chu Yuan, and Wu Yueh, who sacrificed their lives either by saving their country from foreign encroachment or maintaining loyalty to the nation. Finally, early in the 20th century, national radicalism had been a vogue in the Anhui and Chakiang areas in which Hsu Hsi-lin, Chiu Chin's cousin, led an anti-Manchu movement. Hsu was an advocate of assassination, who, to a large extent, influenced Chiu Chin's attitude toward revolution. The two were very disappointed at the failure of the Manchu regime that they felt there was no way but to overthrow it as soon as possible.

In 1906 Chiu Chin arrived in Shanghai from Japan to communicate with her revolutionary comrades and joined a plan there for an uprising. In a letter to her friend, Wang Shih-tse, she said, "since the Boxer Revolution I had already put my life aside for the cause of national revolution," and added, "even if the revolution will not be successful, I will be willing to die for my country without regret."[29] The revolutionaries decided that Liuyang in Hunan and Pinghsiang in Kiangsi should be the centers of the riot. Chiu Chin offered to take up the preparatory work in Chekiang province and she returned to her home town Shaohsing and became the principal of Ta Tung Normal School which was the meeting place of secret societies in Chekiang province. Chiu Chin and the leaders of these secret societies had reached an agreement that they would take action immediately after the outbreak of the uprising in Hunan. Unfortunately, the Hunan uprising failed and many of the comrades were killed.

Chiu Chin sent the graduates from Ta Tung Normal School to their native provinces to spread revolutionary ideas. She also organized the secret societies into eight military contingents. Hsu Hsi-lin and Chiu Chin became commander and vice-commander, respectively. It was agreed between Chiu Chin and the leaders of the eight contingents that in June 1907, the uprising should start in Chiuhau and Chuchou. When the troops of the Manchu government came to relieve these cities, all the contingents in other places were then to immediately launch an attack against Hangchow. Hsu Hsi-liu, who was then in Auhui province, should direct an uprising there the same month. The Manchu government, however, learned of their plan, thus compelling Hsu to strike earlier than planned. This caused the uprising to fail and Hsu lost his life. When Chiu Chin learned of this, she decided to defer the uprising until July 19. On July 12, Manchu soldiers converged in Shaohsing and took Chiu Chin and six other revolutionaries prisoners. Chiu Chin was then

beheaded on July 15, 1907.

Conclusion

Through her thirty-three years of life Chiu Chin struggled for two aims. national salvation and female independence. As has been pointed out, the forces that moved Chiu Chin to sacrificing for these aims are her personal idiosyncrasy and the difficult times she faced. Her radicalism was, in a sense, a reaction to the external impact of Western imperialism and a reflection of anarchism and nihilism which were prevalent in Japan and the southeastern areas of China. Although some Marxist writers related Chiu Chin to Ibsen's Nora, Chiu Chin was, in fact, different from the feminists of the May Fourth movement period. This is because basically Chiu Chin did not have much knowledge of Western culture, nor did she understand individualism. However, in the area of rational nationalism she was influenced by such champions as Napoleon Bonaparte, George Washington, and Sofya Perovskaya.

Chiu Chin was an excellent poet and essayist, but it would be an exaggeration to place her with the first names of Chinese literature. Compared to such prominent writers as Lu Shun, Hsu Chih-mo, and Chu Chih-ching, Chiu Chin is not their peer. Chiu Chin is known not for her literary achievement but for her revolutionary devotion. Without having participated in the 1911 Revolution she might not be known to the modern world.

Why then has Chiu Chin been honored and still will be remembered? The answer may be that Chiu Chin was a female martyr with a strong sense of love for her fellow countrywomen and beloved motherland. As a paradigm of modern Chinese feminists she will attract the attention of future feminist writers. Mary Rankin and Charlotte Beahan, and other feminists have contributed their studies on various aspects of Chiu Chin's life. Nevertheless, such topics as Chiu Chin's ideas on female education, views on patriarchy, theory of gender equality, and politics of social reform are worth studying. Because during the 1980s rich new sources on Chiu Chin are being published in the People's Republic of China, including exegesis and evidential studies of the collected works of Chiu Chin, it seems that the time is ripe to translate these works into English so that they will contribute to the studies of the feminist movement and modern Chinese revolution which Chiu Chin played an important part.

Notes

[1]The 1911 Revolution was considered as a racial revolution because of its emphasis of anti-Manchu slogans. However, after the establishment of the Republic of China in 1912, anti-Manchu policy was given up in favor of a new policy which stressed the harmonious life among five major races of China, i.e., Han, Manchurian, Mongolian, Muslim, Tibetan, and Miao.

[2]Florence Ayscough. Chinese Women Yesterday and Today: Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1975.

[3]Helen Foster Snow. Women in Modern China. Paris: Mouton & Company, 1967.

[4]Mary Backus Rankin. Early Chinese Revolutionaries: Radical Intellectuals in Shanghai and Chakiang, 1902-1911. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971.

[5]Mary Backus Rankin, "The Emergence of Women at the End of the Ching: The Case of Chiu Chin," in Women in Chinese Society, edited by Margery Wolf & Roxane Witke. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1975.

[6]Jonathan D. Spence. The Gate of Heavenly Peace: Chinese and Their Revolution 1895-1980. New York: Viking Press, 1981.

[7]Chiu Tsan-chih. Chiu Chin Ko-ming Chuan. Taipei: Chung-yang hu-kung-hui, 1953.

[8]Meng Tao. Chien-lu Nu-hsia Chiu Chin. Taipei: Chung-yang hu-kung-hui, 1957.

[9]Yu Chao-yi (1956). Chiu Chin. Hong Kong: Ya-chou chu pan she.

[10]Sun Yuan-chao. Hsin-Lai Ko-ming ssu lieh shih mien-pu. Peking: Shu-mu wen-hsien chu-pan she, 1981.

[11]Kuo Yen-li (1982). Chiu Chin shih wen hsuan. Peking: Hsin hua shu tien Peking fa hsing so fa hsing.

[12]Liu Yu-lai (1982). Chiu Chin shih tzu chu-sheh. Yinchuan, PRC: Ningshia hsin hua shu tien fa hsing.

[13]Lin Yin (1983). Hsin-hai ko ming shih-chi ti li-shih jen-wu. Peking: Chung-kuo Ching-nein Chu pan-she.

[14]Sun Yuan-chao, 1981, p. 57. Shen Yun-ying and Chin Liang-yu were regarded as women patriots, therefore they might help Chiu Chin's devotion to national revolution.

[15]Ibid., p. 58

[16]Spence, p. 84.

[17]Chiu Chin. Chiu-feng chin-yu cho sha jen. Taipei: Lijen shu-chiu, 1980, pp. 116-117.

[18]Ibid.

[19]Spence, pp. 85-86.

[20]Chiu Chin, pp. 43-44.

[21]Ibid.

[22]Snow, pp. 94-95; Rankin, pp. 40-43; Lin Yin, pp. 101-102.

[23]Meng Yao, 1957, pp. 87-90. Meng Yao specifically emphasizes the positive values of Confucian ethics, the close relation between Sun Yat-sen and Chiu Chin, and anti-Japanese attitudes. She pays sympathy toward Chiu Chin's husband probably because her husband was opposed to Chiu Chin's trip to Japan.

[24]Chiu Chin, p. 12.

[25]Chiu Chin, p. 37. It is believed that Chiu Chin had deserted her husband and children. It is worth studying why she became so indifferent to her children because in her collected writings nothing could be found in relation to them.

[26]Chiu Chin, p. 91.

[27]Spence, p.

[28]Chiu Chin, p. 101.

[29]Snow, p. 96.

NEW THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES ON EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Spencer J. Maxcy
Louisiana State University

There is a significant shift, some would say of paradigmatic dimensions, in the theoretical stance toward organizations that is impacting how we think about schooling and all educational reform. After decades of positivist and rationalist efforts by researchers in educational administration to make determinate descriptions of organizations, new theoretical perspectives -- variously lumped under titles like "post-structural," "post-positivist," and "postmodern" -- are gaining hold of the research conscience (Maxcy, 1994). The result is, that a number of crucial differences have emerged regarding how one views organizations, what role the observer takes, and what kinds of factors are deemed important at the levels of theory and practice.

Efforts to re-vitalize thinking regarding organizations has been piecemeal and largely unheralded by mainstream researchers in education since T.B. Greenfield's work in the 1970's. Popular texts and preparation programs for educational administrators continue to assume a structuralist orientation. However, a bright light is visible in theorizing that may just wake us out of our slumber.

Postmodern Organizational Theory

Beyond the structural, functional, and rational-scientific characterization of organization we find new "postmodern" visions of human groups that provoke interesting possibilities. Postmodernism and organizations forms a new area of research for British sociologists (Gergen, 1992; Hazzard & Parker, 1993). Drawing upon the writings of Baudrillard, Derrida, Lyotard, and Foucault postmodernists speak of key themes: representation, reflexivity, writing, differance, de-centering the subject, and power relations (Hazzard, 1993).

First, the representation of organizations has historically taken the form of a theory-neutral language used to describe the empirical facts. Postmodernist thinkers argue that data collection is already prejudiced by theory, and the findings of such a science of organization reflects these pre-existing categories. Next, through reflexivity, we are to come to critique our own intellectual assumptions and to see that efforts to use language to describe an independent organizational reality are problematic --- yielding grand narratives. Third, social scientists use writing to depict the organization, but following Derrida, the postmodernists see this sign system as possessing implicit difficulties. Writing is a paradoxical and undecidable form of action: it has its own counters built into it that make of writing a self-propelling activity beyond mere inscription of fact. Four, the concept of <u>differance</u> has emerged in postmodern thought to name the essentially ambiguous state of terminological meaning. Concepts are both binary and the processes of dividing them is an action of differing. Postmodernists favor a de-centering of the subject. This is to say that the individual is no longer seen as the privileged observer/agent regarding the organizational world. Finally, following Michel Foucault, postmodernists have come to criticize traditional views of knowledge and power. Rather than lodged in some individual or group, power is seen as amorphous and relational, while knowledge is subject to the vagaries of time.

It must not be assumed that postmodernism is without its critics. Norris (1990) severely chastises postmodernists for inherent contradictions and a misunderstanding of the Enlightenment tradition. J. Habermas, finds modernity hardly finished in the face of talk of adopting "postmodern" approaches. Nonetheless, a kind of pragmatic shift to alternatives -- broadly construed as beyond the modern -- are surfacing in educational theorizing. It is these that we wish to consider here.

1. Schools as Chaotic Systems.

Research physics has impacted organizational study through "chaos theory." First popularized by James Gleick in his book <u>Chaos</u> (1987), chaos theory is a set of research assumptions that have gained an increased following amongst social scientists. Researchers who embrace this perspective seek to describe, reproduce or in other ways account for the orderly beneath disorderly phenomena. Mathematical and metaphorical models emerge from the study of weather systems, turbulent fluids, star systems, etc. Organizations are taken to be nonlinear systems to be managed using the tools provided by chaos theory (Priesmeyer, 1992, xiii).

Educational researchers have become entranced by chaos theory of late. Curriculum theorists propose that chaos theory is the best avenue to the study of the psycho-physical pulsations of curriculum change in the schools (Doll, 1993). Marion (1992) identifies three approaches to the study of chaos in organizations: metaphorical analysis; mathematical modeling, and data collecting. Cziko (1989) points to the fact that educational researchers have overlooked the basic issue of indeterminacy in their field. While battles raged over qualitative versus quantitative research, the possibility that the phenomena studied were essentially irregular and unpredictable looms large.

Chaos theory is not without ambiguity where it is applied to education. Critics find within this approach to persons and organizations a kind of Calvinist predestination: some individuals and portions of organizations seem to have an elite survivalist status. It may well be a renewed effort to introduce a superorganic vision of organization --- schools as meta-organic realities, sui generis and operating according to its own laws. Chaos theory seems to send the message to organiztional theorists that our best bet is simply to try to understand sublime patterns (pedagogical fractals?) in the mess that is school.

2. School Organizations as Cultures

The view that schools have a culture is not a new notion. Broad cultural and philosophic postmodern approaches to organization may be traced back to Friedrich Nietzsche, Ludwig Wittgenstein and John Dewey. Within more traditional educational administration writing, Weick (1976;1979) proposed that organizations are noted for their diversity. In education the subsystems may only be loosely connected with one another. For example, the school superintendent's behavior does not directly affect the teacher in his/her classroom. Furthermore, the organization need not be 'rational.' Each part of the system has a certain degree of autonomy. Loosely coupled organizations have an advantage: if one subsystem becomes critical, the others need not be affected. There is more individualism allowed for the actors as well. Of course these virtues may work against an organization. (Foster, 1986 pp. 129-131)

It is vital to see theories of school organization as culture to assume one or more concepts of 'culture.' At one extreme the school as culture view of organization allows empiricists to locate and measure variables, trace interactions among constituent parts, and in other ways treat schools as holistic entities as they have always done. Researchers embracing anthropological categories may conduct positivist business as usual.

Midway in the continuum of school as culture study is to be found the functionalist sociological perspective. Here researchers stress the instrumentalist mentality. Functionalist anthropologists often use this sociological perspective as well. The difficulty with this theoretical mind-set is that schools as cultures must differ from schools as societies. Efforts to reduce culture to a distillate of society with determinist vectors leaves us without explanation of culture-driven creativity and change. Cultural practices, moreover, need not be acquired by a human within societal groups: It is entirely possible to initiate private culture creations without societal validation. In fact, many of the greatest culture creations were a result of just such singular behavior.

At the opposite extreme we find "postmodern culture." Here schooling is taken to be avant garde aesthetic expression. This opposite pole of the culture concept finds schools as cultures to be both concept and reality. Culture consists of acquired or cultivated behavior and thought of individuals within a society, as well as the intellectual, artistic, and social ideals and institutions which the members of society profess and to which they strive to conform (Bidney, 1967, p. 30) School cultures are peculiar in the fact that they seek to formally perpetuate and sustain these cultural characteristics conceived of as both ideas and realities, while also manifesting methods and techniques of study, description, and explanation of culture and society.

What seems different about postmodern views of culture is the characteristics of rites, rituals, myths and folklore, not as imbedded recursive structures, but rather as efforts to provide meaning in a world of uncertainty. Culture forms a glue-like function linking players on the field of play. As such they are primary elements in community and other forms of organizational life. Rather than viewing these structurally, postmodern thinkers are examining culture components as human efforts to deal with phenomena and render these meaningful.

School organization qua culture provides new focus upon old problems. Gender takes on unique characteristics, race is viewed differently, the physical characteristics of humans within organizations is looked at seriously (Calas & Smircich, 1992). While some of these matters are subject to "politically correct" proposals for change, the re-direction of attention to features of membership in group life captures larger responses. Within postmodern writings we find a new interest in the tactile, rhythmic, and olafactory senses. Postmodern educational organizations no longer are seen as possessing geometric precision, implicit roles or rules, or "proper" aims and goals.

3. School Organizations as Moral Enterprises.

While there has been a consistent thread of theories focused on the moral, ethical and valuative elements in organizations, the new postmodern thinkers make these primary. Modernists, Sergiovanni (1992) and Hodgkinson (1991) emphasize the need of education institutions to take on a moral leadership role. Postmodernists Miron and Elliott (1994), Fazzaro, Walter, & McKerrow (1994) and others look at organizations in non-positivistic post-structural ways. These writers propose a new "moral leadership" that will lead to organizational re-configuration as opposed to mere structuralist re-adjustment school reforms currently popular in modernist camps.

Drawing upon the writings of Foucault, postmodernist educational theorists propose that schools are "panopticons" in need of reform. The prisoners, patients, or students are observed, yet cannot observe their jailers. The result is a fusion of knowledge/power that disables one from coming to know his/her condition (McKinney & Garrison, 1994).

New interest in the moral imperatives of organizational life have prompted researchers in educational administration to take seriously moral attitudes toward colleagues and work. Marshall (1993) stresses "caring" as the key descriptive feature of the career-assistant principal in schools she has investigated. Noblitt (1993) offers caution as we adopt caring into the school organization. His studies reveal the double edge to caring: where we come to care too much, losses in purpose and design may result.

Philosophic Approaches to Postmodern Organization

Several philosophic thematic approaches have gained popularity amongst postmodernists. To a greater or lesser extent postmodernism may include these schools of thought:

Deconstructionism. The most influential philosophic approach on postmodern thought has been Deconstructionism. The collection of writers, many of them French, that make up this school is extensive. Derrida, Lyotard, Baurillard, stand out as deconstructionists who have seriously de-constructed the way we think about our world. Certainly, Lyotard's book The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge (Minneapolis: U. of Minnesota Press, 1985), has had profound influence on the postmodernists. Two of the lesser known writers in this version of postmodern

philosophy are Giles Deleuze and Feliz Guattari. Authors of Anti-Oedipus (Minneapolis: U. of Minnesota Press, 1977) and A Thousand Plateaus (Minneapolis: U. of Minnesota Press, 1987), these philosopers speak of organizational life in terms of "desiring machines," "bodies without organs," and "nomadic subjects." Deleuze and Guattari talk of three types of organizational machine: the primitiave, the barbarian and the civilized (capitalist) machine. Their writings are seen as tools for the dismantling of hierarchical, monolithic, and fascistic organizations -- a genuinely new line of thinking (Bogue, 1989, pp. 102-106). Of all the postmodernists, these two writers seem to be some of the most interesting for organizational theorists to contemplate.

Critical Theory. Some of the Critical Theorists seem to be postmodernists. A conflict educational organizational theory drawing upon the work of Freire, Giroux (1988), McLaren (1989), and other "Critical Pedagogues" is deeply committed to values and their transvaluation. Emancipation is at the heart of this Critical Theory agenda. One of the principles of Critical Pedagogy/Critical Theory/Critical Humanism is the belief that human actors inhabit a world of contradictions, one of the primary being the use of power and privilege. Freedom is lacking in the modernist world: Hegemony dominates. While schools are the playing field for historical interests. The concepts of power, social class and culture are important for the Critical Theorist. Power and knowledge are tightly coupled (e.g. 'power/knowledge' in Foucault's writings.)

Through the mechanism of 'Social Reproduction,' organizations reproduce certain values of society (e.g.corporate business, the media, etc.,) (McLaren, 1989). William Foster (1986) offers a critical administration model that draws heavily upon the political theories of Georgian Habermas. For Foster, the following characteristics mark the critical administrator: 1. A concern for issues of justice and equity; 2. A moral and literary mode; 3. See the school as a text (number of narratives) which continuously transform the school; 4. Change marks local characters, circumstances and cultures; 5. Engage in critique (of history, action and character) in terms of the reproductive function of schooling; and, 6. Leadership is engaged in reformulating the visions (through reflection, understanding and education). Foster trusts that administrators would subject beliefs to critical reflection toward the end of practical change (praxis) (Foster, 1986).

One difficulty facing the Critical Theorists is the avowed refusal to admit the fact that modernity is ending and postmodernity beginning. Habermas, for one, clings to the Enlightenment ideals. Those Critical Theorists who move closer to pragmatic philosophy seem to accept postmodernity as a fact.

Critical Pragmatism. Simply stated the contemporary problems facing schools in the United States are a result of our inability to see things differently, and where this has occurred, to then act on that vision. In large measure, the disabling of perception grows out of our conception of the way the world works and how society does in fact change.

The Critical pragmatic approach sees society facing problems that divide us and cause our citizens to be underserved by our institutions. It is important to know what the marks are of this Critical Pragmatism and to demonstrate how it may help us in meeting the crises that face us today.

Critical pragmatism is derived historically from the pragmatic writings of William James, John Dewey and Charles Sanders Peirce. Elements of this philosophic orientation may be traced to three further sources: George S. Counts, Theodore Brameld, and Boyd H. Bode. More recently, it has been drawn from the writings of Richard J. Bernstein and Richard Rorty. Contemporary works in critical pragmatism dealing with society and education are Power and Criticism (1988), by Cleo Cherryholmes and my own Educational Leadership: A Critical Pragmatic Perspective (1991). Newer works, such as John Forester's Critical Theory, Public Policy, and Planning Practice (1993), seek to link Critical Theory and Pragmatism.

Critical pragmatism is consistent in its denial of any foundationalist perspective, however, that anti-foundationalism has strong and weak versions (Scheurich, 1994). We must be on alert to the differences in the pragmatic views of Rorty and Bernstein, example. Whereas Rorty averts the political nature of organizational life, Bernstein is sensitive to it. Where we seek to re-construct schooling, it would be important to see the textual nature of groups (writing their autobiographies), we must not miss the politics of such inscription.

While postmodern approaches include the above, it is interesting to note that facets of deconstructionism, Critical Theory, pragmatic philosophy are melded by theorists to lay claim to improved understanding of how leadership and organization operate in this world. We can only surmise that this agreeable condition is temporary. Postmodernism has a deep thread of critique that runs through it: We shall certainly see more battles rage within its ranks.

Renewed Interest in Democratic Organization

Except for a brief period in the early part of this century, the notion that schools ought to be organized in some democratic manner has never caught on. This, despite the fact that John Dewey popularized the linkage between democracy and education early in this century (Democracy and Education, 1916). Peter Drucker in 1980 proposed that professionalism was the answer to bureaucratic inefficiency. He saw that teachers and staff could not be managed as if they were assembly-line workers. Professionals were to be seen as "knowledge workers" with responsibility so that a qualitatively better level of organizational participation could be achieved (Drucker, 1980, 190).

Several exciting inroads into democratic theory of organization have emerged. Dryzek (1990) and Barber (1984) speak of "discursive democracy" and "strong democracy." Efforts to draw upon these new views of participatory democracy and apply them to education are in the works with Snauwaert (1993), for example, speaking of democratically organized schooling as tied to human development versus bureaucratic efficiency.

One example of the embrace of democratic organizational principles emerging in systems thinking is the "leadership team" concept (Synder & Anderson, 1986, 174). Built upon the assumptions that work must be organized around tasks, and users involved in decision-making, schools are re-configuring administrative and teaching responsibilities. The principal is seen as one who coordinates a number of work groups, while teach-

ers are formed into collectivities of from five to seven people. Teachers must be involved in all planning. Dialogue, decision-making, and action are essential to the successfully organized school. Group effort is more likely to lead to productivity. Small groups seem to generate a greater clarity of purpose, coordination of effort, and trusting work relationship. Organization of schools must reflect two kinds of groupings: permanent small groups for recurring needs; and temporary work groups for short-term goal achievement (Synder & Anderson, 174-176).

Democratic postmodernism is particularly concerned to show how school administration qua management needs to be replaced by school as social text characterized by dialogue. School administration shifts from management to cultural leadership (Johnston, 1994). Schools are in the process of re-structuring with the consequence that administrative and teaching responsibilities, under the umbrella of democratic organization, are taking on new meanings.

Conclusions

The implications of postmodern thinking for organizational theory are: more diverse theorizing narratives, a re-thinking of assumptions and grounds for organization, a greater sensitivity to values (moral, ethical and aesthetic) in organizational life, a wider range of research imperatives, and a pragmatic interest in organizational change.

But, what does one say about the shift in organizational thinking to an audience of philosophers?

Burbules (1989) finds philosophy and philosophy of education are becoming reformist disciplines. The great (renewed) popularity of pragmatism helps to account for this (although it does not fully account). Theory and practice are coming together. Philosophers are paying more attention to the problems in the social sciences, but not from the perspective of some privileged perch. Philosophers of education are beginning to look seriously at difficulties within fields like Educational Administration, Curriculum, and Instruction. Burbules (1989) tells us that philosophy of education may help in "elucidating the communicative relations" of educative interactions. Innovations and reforms sit between institutional politics and the higher values at play. The role of the philosopher is one of examining the pedagogical acts of explaining, negotiating, listening, arguing, understanding and correcting misconceptions, Burbules tells us (pp. 247-248).

With special reference to the school administrator in the organization of the school, Burbules finds that "...the role of the school administrator is always and essentially the role of a teacher and learner, and how the constraints of bureaucratic organization and power relations often interfere with the legitimate performance of that role" (p. 248).

Burbules' admonition to philosophers to adopt an interest in communication is clearly within the modernist camp established by Habermas and philosophers of social and educational science. Such a view limits the possibilities of the organizational revolution currently launched. Certainly one area of enormous promise for future investigation in philosophy of education is elucidating the communicative relations that underlie organizational life. But, beyond Burbules' charge lies the import of surfacing the values that inform our thinking about organizations like schools. Simply put, educational administration research has overlooked the unique nature of the goals schools seek to realize, while forcing the institutions to operate like factories and shops. Postmodernity helps us see the chaotic/structured nature of organization, the role of subjectivity in interpretation and description, the dualistic nature of researcher and knowing, and the priority of professional norms for adjudicating epistemological debates. Rather than a modernist negotiator, mediator or go-between role for philosophers of education, it would seem more appropriate for philosopher/researchers to challenge the assumed rationality that informs such posturing. Only by challenging all the fundamental assumptions that underwrite modernist organizational theorizing, and posting new postmodern approaches may we free the field of organizational theory from its retrograde attitudes: What is required is a postmodern perspective, and with it the courage to re-design school organizational life.

---

1 Note: Research literature dealing with leadership clusters into three areas growing out of the definitions attached to leadership: leadership as traits; leadership as behaviors; and, leadership as setting or environment. These three definitions are related to the three basic ways defining has come to view its object: the object as have imbedded features; as being defined in terms of what it does; and as something that has neither imbedded feature or autonomy of action, but is determined by surrounding natural conditions. Leadership, insofar as it has rested upon traditional defining practice, lies fallow.

Sources

Apple, Michael W. (1979). Ideology and curriculum. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul

Ausbaugh, Carl R. and Katherine L. Kasten (1991). Educational Leadership: Case Studies in Reflective Practice. New York: Longman.

Barber, B. (1984). Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics for a New Age. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Barnard, C.I. (1938; 1968). The Functions of the Executive. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bates, R. (1988). "Is There a New Paradigm in Educational Administration?" A paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, April, 1988, pp. 16-17.

Bidney, D. (1967). Theoretical Anthropology. Second Augmented Edition. New York: Schocken.

Bogue, R. (1989). Deleuze and Guattari. London: Routledge.

Bolman, L.G. & T. E. Deal (1991). Reframing Organizations. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Brameld, Theodore (1965). Education as power. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Burbules, N. (1989). "Issues and Trends in the Philosophy of Education." Educational Administration Quarterly, 25(3), pp. 229-252.

Calas, M.B. & L. Smircich (1992). "Re-Writing Gender into Organizational Theorizing: Directions from Feminist Perspectives." In M. Reed & M. Hughes, Rethinking Organization: New Directions in Organization Theory and Analysis. London: Sage, pp. 227-253.

Cambron-McCabe, N. (1992). "8 Leadership for Democratic Authority." In J. Murphy, Ed., Preparing Tomorrow's School Leaders: Alternative Designs. University Park, PA: UCEA, pp. 157-176.

Cziko, G.A. (1989). "Unpredictability and Indeterminism in Human Behavior: Arguments and Implications for Educational Research." Educational Researcher. 18(3), pp. 17-25.

Davies, J. & W. Foster (1994). "A Postmodernist Analysis of Educational Administration." In Postmodern School Leadership. S.J. Maxcy, ed. New York: Praeger, pp. 61-68.

Deal, T. & A. Kennedy (1982). Corporate Cultures. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Deleuze, G. & F. Guattari (1983). Anti-Oedipus. Minneapolis: U. of Minnesota Press.

Deleuze, G. & F. Guattari (1987). A Thousand Plateaus. Minneapolis: U. of Minnesota Press.

Dewey, John (1934). Art as Experience. New York: Minton, Balch & Co.

Dewey, John (1916). Essays in Experimental Logic. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Dewey, J. (1916). Democracy and Education. New York: Macmillan.

Dewey, John (1910; 1933). How We Think. Boston: D.C. Heath & Co.

Dewey, John (1938). Logic: The Theory of Inquiry. New York: Henry Holt.

Dill, D.D. (1992). "Organization and Administration of Higher Education." Encyclopedia of Educational Research, M.C. Alkin, Ed., 6th Ed., Vol. 3, New York: Macmillan, pp. 933-941.

Drucker, P. (1980). Managing in Turbulent Times. New York: Harper & Row.

Dryzek, J.S. (1990). Discursive Democracy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Evers, C.W. & G. (1991). Knowing Educational Administration. Oxford: Pergamon.

Fay, B. (1987). Critical social science: Liberation and its limits. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Fazzaro, C.J., J.E. Walter, & K. McKerrow (1994). "Education Administration in a Postmodern Society: Implications for Moral Practice." In Postmodern School Leadership. S.J. Maxcy, ed. New York: Praeger, pp. 85-95.

Foster, H. (Ed.) (1983). The Anti-Aesthetic. Post Townsend, WA: Bay Press.

Foster, W. (1986). Paradigms and Promises. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus.

Gergen, K.J. (1992). "Organization Theory in the Postmodern Era." In M. Reed & M. Hughes, Rethinking Organization: New Directions in Organization Theory and Analysis. London: Sage, pp. 207-226.

Giroux, H.A. (1988). Teachers as intellectuals: Toward a critical pedagogy of learning. Granby, MA: Bergin & Garvey.

Greenfield, T. (1985). "Theories of Educational Organization: A Critical Perspective." In T. Husen & T.N. Postlewaite., Eds., The International Encyclopedia of Educational Research: Research and Studies. Oxford: Pergamon, pp. 52-51.

Hazzard, J. (1993). "Postmodernism and Organizational Analysis: An Overview." In Hazzard, J. & M. Parker, eds. Postmodernism and Organizations. London: Sage, pp. 1-23.

Hazzard, J. & M. Parker, eds. (1993). Postmodernism and Organizations." London: Sage.

Hodgkinson, C. (1983). The Philosophy of Leadership. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Hullfish, H.G. & P.G. Smith (1961). Reflective Thinking: The Method of Education. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co.

Johnston, B.J. (1994). "Educational Administration in the Postmodern Age." In Postmodern School Leadership. S.J. Maxcy, ed. New York: Praeger, pp. 115-131.

Keat, R. (1981). The politics of social theory: Habermas, Freud and the critique of positivism. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakatos, I. (1970). "Falsification and the Methodology of Scientific Research Programmes." In I. Lakatos and A. Musgrave, eds., Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge. London: Cambridge University Press.

Lawrence, P.R. & J.W. Lorsch (1986). Organization and Environments. Rev. Ed. Boston Harvard Business School Press.

Lehrer, R., R.C. Serlin, & R. Amundson (1990). "Knowledge or Certainty: A Reply to Cziko." Educational Researcher, 19(6), pp. 16-19.

Lyotard, J. (1985). The Postmodern Condition: A

Report on Knowledge. Minneapolis: U. of Minnesota Press.

McCarthy, T. (1978). The critical theory of Georgian Habermas. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

McLaren, Peter (1989). Life in schools. New York: Longman.

Marion, R. (1992). "Chaos, Topology, and Social Organization." Journal of School Leadership, 2, pp. 144-177.

Marshall, C. (1993). "Caring as Career: Alternative Models for Administration." Paper presented before the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, Ga, April.

Maxcy, S.J. (1994). "Introduction." In S.J. Maxcy, ed., Postmodern School Leadership. New York: Praeger.

Maxcy, S.J. (1991). Educational Leadership: A Critical Pragmatic Approach. New York: Bergin and Garvey.

Mink, O.G., J.M. Schultz & B. Mink (1979). Developing and Managing Open Organizations: A Model and Method for Maximizing Organizational Potential. Austin, TX: Learning Concepts.

Miron, L.F. & R.J. Elliott (1994). "Moral Leadership in a Poststructural Era." In Postmodern School Leadership. S.J. Maxcy, ed. New York: Praeger, pp. 134-140.

Morgan, G. (1986). Images of Organization. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Murphy, J. (Ed.) (1993). Preparing Tomorrow's School Leaders: Alternative Designs. University Park, PA: UCEA.

Norris, C. (1990). What's Wrong with Postmodernism: Critical Theory and the Ends of Philosophy. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.

Owens, R.G. (1987). Organizational Behavior in Education. 3rd ed. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Peterson, M.W. (1985). "Emerging Developments in Postsecondary Organization Theory and Research: Fragmentation or Integration." Educational Researcher, 14(3), 5-12.

Pitner, N.J. (1983). "Principal Influences on Teacher Behavior: Substitutes for Leadership." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada.

Priesmeyer, H.R. (1992). Organizations and Chaos: Defining the Methods of Nonlinear Management. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.

Richardson, Virginia (1990). "The Evolution of Reflective Teaching and Teacher Education," in R.T. Clift, W.R. Houston, & M.C. Pugach, eds. Encouraging Reflective Practice in Education. New York: Teachers College Press, 3 -19.

Scheurich, J.J. (1994). "Social Relativism: A Postmodernist Epistemology for Educational Administration." In Postmodern School Leadership. S.J. Maxcy, ed. New York: Praeger, pp. 17-45.

Sergiovanni, T.J. (1992). Moral Leadership: Getting to the Heart of School Improvement. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sergiovanni, T.J. The Principalship: A Reflective Practice Perspective. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Snauwaert, D.T. (1993). Democracy, Education and Governance: A Developmental Conception. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Synder, K.J. & R.H. Anderson (1986). Managing Productive Schools: Toward an Ecology. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

White, S. K. (1988). The Recent Work of Jurgen Habermas: Reason, justice & modernity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

IMAGES OF AFRICAN-AMERICAN TEACHERS IN THE AMERICAN SOUTH: A COLONIZED PEOPLE, CARRIERS OF THE NEW SLAVERY, OR HUMAN AGENTS

Clinton B. Allison
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

This exploration of images to depict African-American teachers is in the context of the early twentieth century South, the period on which much of the historiographical controversy on black education has been centered. A bit of historical context is necessary. At the beginning of the twentieth century, the southern states still lacked public school systems, though they had been provided by law. Public schools lacked popular and, as a result, financial support. Those that existed were often truly miserable and, though it is unfashionable to use the word, even primitive. In the rural South (and most of the region was rural), public schools were often little more than shacks, heated by fireplaces and taught by semi-literate teachers who frequently had but months of elementary schooling themselves, and these were the schools for white students. Where they existed, schools for African-American students were almost always worse. These conditions were a result of poverty, of cultural attitudes about schooling and public expenditures for social purposes, and, of most consequence for this paper, of race.

The Southern Education Campaign

In the first decade of the twentieth century, a gigantic propaganda campaign was launched to convert white southerners to a faith in public school systems--the southern educational movement. The campaign was led by ministers (North and South) and southern educators, and financed by northern "philanthropists"--captains of merchandising and industry. The Conference for Education in the South was the propaganda arm of the movement. The Southern Education Board and the General Education Board solicited and administered the large sums that flowed south from Yankee philanthropists. The leaders of the campaign were convinced that a major obstacle to the establishment of public school systems was opposition by white southerners to schooling for African-Americans. They feared particularly that reactionary politicians would use the "race issue" to defeat legislation to raise taxes for education.

The leaders of the campaign, northerners as well as southerners, did not challenge southern racism. That southern society was to be strictly segregated was never openly questioned by leaders of the campaign. The issue was settled by the first president of the Conference, the venerable old Confederate J. L. M. Curry: "The white people are to be the leaders, to take the initiative, to have the directive control in all matters pertaining to civilization and the highest interest of our beloved land. History demonstrates that the Caucasian will rule."[1] In the age of Social Darwinism, it is doubtful that the northern business leaders in the movement differed much in their racial attitudes. Just a generation removed from Reconstruction and its perceived excesses by the Yankee teachers in the South, northern reformers had to appear particularly sensitive to white southern sensibilities.

The politically-astute campaigners argued successfully that the proper kind of education for African-Americans would directly benefit whites. These "southern progressives" proposed a limited, special education for blacks: industrial and agricultural education. It was schooling to keep African-Americans "in their place"--on the bottom rung of the economic and social ladder. It was to teach proper values, particularly the work ethic, as well as to develop the manual skills that whites wanted black workers to have. Models were already in place; whites were in the process of making Booker T. Washington the most powerful African-American of the era. "From Hampton came a Moses, and Tuskegee was born," wrote William H. Baldwin, president of the Southern Railroad and a charter member of the Southern Education Board.[2]

In the 1980s, southern governors, including Bill Clinton, Lamar Alexander, and Richard Riley, used the creation of human capital as the justification for school reforms. Although the term human capital had not yet been coined, their predecessors at the beginning of the century justified their better schools reform with the same appeal. Perhaps nowhere was the economic viewpoint of the movement more powerfully revealed than by Walter Hines Page: "In an ideal economic state, if we were to construct it as ruthlessly as Plato constructed his ideal Republic, we should kill every untrained man; for he is in the way. He is a burden, and he brings down the level of the economic efficiency of the whole community."[3]

Historical Interpretations

Historians of the African-American experience in southern educational campaigns are now in their third generation. For most of this century, traditional historians pictured the campaign leaders much as they pictured themselves, as "big-hearted patriotic philanthropists" who created industrial schools particularly appropriate for African-Americans.[4] One of the leaders of the campaign, Charles Dabney, in Universal Education in the South wrote the pioneering celebrationist work.

Beginning in the 1970s, new left or radical revisionist historians, often influenced by reproduction theories, pictured industrial education for African-Americans in the early twentieth century as both caste-biased and exploitive. Clarence Karier accused the southern school reformers of using education for social control and repression.[5] Donald Spivey calls black industrial education a "schooling for a new slavery."[6]

A third school of historians has stressed African-

American resistance to white efforts to impose an outdated, racist curriculum on them. African-Americans subverted training schools into academic institutions; curricula officially industrial were literary in practice. Henry Allen Bullock noted this "hidden passage" to schooling more like that of whites in his A History of Negro Education in the South (1967).[7] James D. Anderson has found imposition and resistance in a number of works, including his notable The Education of Blacks in the South, 1860-1935.[8] Resistance of African-Americans to the industrial and agricultural curriculum in nominally industrial schools is treated explicitly by John R. Wennersten.[9]

African-American Teachers

It is within this context of conflicting historical interpretations of industrial education as the appropriate kind of education for African-Americans that the roles of the black teachers of the South are to be identified. With few exceptions, by the time of the southern educational campaign, schooling for African-American youth was the responsibility of black teachers, most of whom had but a few months of elementary schooling themselves. In 1916, as an example, seventy percent of Alabama's rural black teachers had only the lowest-grade certificate, indicating that they had not completed elementary school.[10] Fisk, Talladega, Howard, Atlanta, and other black liberal arts colleges educated teachers, but their enrollments were small and the need for teachers was huge.

As part of their educational campaign, the southern progressives, particularly through the Slater and Jeanes funds, turned their attention to the training of black teachers. The Slater Fund helped build 355 black training schools with an industrial curriculum and normal courses to train teachers. Tuskegee and the black land-grant colleges established in 1890 also trained large numbers of teachers in the industrial philosophy.

Those rural teachers who were untrained in industrial schools did not escape the attention of the southern progressives. At the beginning of the century, white school officials often ignored black rural teachers. In 1912, a South Carolina school supervisor lamented: "The negro [sic] schools of South Carolina are for the most part without supervision of any kind. Frequently the county superintendent does not know where they are located, and sometimes the district board cannot tell where the Negro school is taught."[11] The mixed blessing of being ignored ended with the coming of the omnipresent Jeanes supervisors. Supported by the Anna T. Jeanes Foundation, they sent trained teachers (all African-Americans) to provide demonstration lessons, particularly on industrial, agricultural, and homemaking education, to rural black teachers throughout the South. During the 1915-16 school year, as an example, Jeanes teachers visited 910 of North Carolina's 1,046 African-American schools.[12] Jeanes teachers encouraged black teachers to attend summer school at Hampton, Tuskegee, or one of the 1890 African-American land-grant institutions. In one way or another, the doctrine of industrial education was preached to African-American teachers throughout the South.

A Colonized People

In pondering images that might help denote African-American teachers and their responses to an imposed industrial curriculum, I considered Robin Morgan's concept of women as a colonized people.[13] Of course, colonized, in the sense she used it, goes much beyond strict political and economic imperialism. Peter McLaren and Rhonda Hammer describe the process: "The colonizer, through the use of 'tokens' and the aid of 'collaborators' ensures that the colonized remain in a state of 'false' or 'imaginary' consciousness. In other words, the colonized are taught to believe the dominant ideological myths about their collective being, and act accordingly."[14] When Morgan advanced the idea of women being a colonized people, she was accused of going too far. Regardless of that debate, it does seem to me that in the turn-of-the-century South, African-American teachers might well be depicted as a colonized people. They were teachers, mainly women, and black. Even white teachers had, in Dan Lortie's words, a shadowed social position.[15] Paternalistic treatment by males pervaded both the working lives and the home lives of women teachers. And, in Jim Crow's South, African-Americans were in fact a subject people.

Certainly, many African-American teachers believed the "dominant ideology" that industrial schooling was the most appropriate kind of education for black youth. In this image, the "tokens" provided by the "colonizers" were some opportunities for schooling, even if it were a different, inferior education appropriate for a "subject people." The collaborators were Booker T. Washington and his followers, perhaps including the Jeanes teachers. As a subject people the teachers would not only have to teach the special curriculum but would have to be humble and patient in trying to get support from their colonizers in improving their lot. A 1930 National Education Association Bulletin praises the "heroic" work of "hundreds of patient and persistent souls among the Negro Teachers! . . . who have grown old in the service and who by faith have kept at their tasks amid discouragement and delays pleading for a better chance to do their work."[16] The patience theme persists throughout the publication. The author, a field agent of the General Education Board, commends black teachers for their "patient waiting" for a more equitable share of school funds, "striving to advance a little here, a little there . . . . Each small favor has been thankfully received and the evidences of appreciation . . . have frequently paved the way for the next step."[17] In a racist conclusion typical of the time, he also warned that black teachers should not be militant but should present their requests "in the semi-humorous vein which characterizes the Negro."[18]

But, of course, a subject people, regardless of their acquiescent behavior, are never really safe. Enid, a Jeanes teacher, recounts her experience:

> I was driving down the highway to a school in my 1932 Chevrolet sedan and was forced off the road by an older model car with five passengers, all white men. When I stopped, they yelled, "Nigger, whose car is that, and where are you going?" Quickly and diplomatically, I replied, "This car

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

> belongs to my Missus. She is sick and I am going to the store to get some liniment for her." . . . If I had to deceive the white man about my professional and economic status, I, without guilt or humiliation, would do so until he could truly accept the rights and privileges of a black female in the land of the free and the home of the brave.[19]

Carrier of the New Slavery

"Carrier of the New Slavery" is another, although not necessarily a contradictory, way of depicting the African-American teacher. This image suggests that the major purpose of industrial training schools was to train black teachers who were the major agents in spreading the industrial ethic among the African-American population. In Schooling for the New Slavery, Donald Spivey's thesis was: "in a sense, the schoolhouse was to replace the stability lost by the demise of the institution of slavery." Samuel Chapman Armstrong and other advocates of industrial education thought that "the solution to the race problem" was in training black teachers to teach proper values to African-American youth.[20] An account of the work of the Jeanes teachers calls it "social engineering at its best."[21] Although historians of black education, such as Henry Bullock, had long observed that black land-grant and other agricultural and mechanical colleges willy-nilly ended up training teachers, not scientific farmers or industrial workers, Spivey and James D. Anderson argued that training teachers as agents of the industrial ethic was actually the goal of these schools. According to Anderson, there was a struggle over the minds of black southerners between private liberal arts institutions controlled by African-Americans and the powerful advocates of industrial education in the philanthropic funds and in the Booker T. Washington Tuskegee Machine. Anderson argues that both contemporaries of the training schools and later historians have missed an important point: industrial education was less concerned with producing skilled industrial workers than with training "industrial teachers for the black common schools."[22]

The cost of failing to be an earnest carrier of industrial education could be high. Anderson provides a case study of an African-American teacher, John W. Davison. He was a graduate of Atlanta University who, in 1890, founded Fort Valley High and Industrial School of Georgia. Although the school was designated as a public normal and industrial institution in 1895, Davison had to spend his own money to keep the school afloat, mortgaging his farm to pay school expenses. Accepting financial support from northern philanthropists, he was forced to barter an academic curriculum for industrial training in order to survive. In 1903, after a humiliating requirement by the philanthropists to attend a summer session at Hampton Institute "for an orientation to the proper industrial education curriculum," he was dismissed from the school that he had created. He simply could not satisfy the philanthropists that he was a true believer in industrial education for African-Americans.[23]

Human Agents

Both the "subject people" and the "carriers of new slavery" images suggest that the goals of the powerful coalition of forces that imposed industrial education on African-Americans were also the outcomes. The image of African-American teachers as human agents suggests that they resisted a racist education imposed by southern progressives. In a 1991 paper, John R. Wennersten states this thesis explicitly:

> The failures that these schools experienced were largely the result of black resistance to white attempts to force a curriculum of higher education on southern blacks that would perpetuate their status and provide them with skills rapidly becoming obsolete in a sophisticated industrial society.[24]

Part of the campaign of black teachers was to drive white supremacist faculty away, even with fist fights in some cases. Under black control, these schools "quickly became teacher-training institutions whose academic emphasis was more literary than industrial and agricultural."[25] Of course, similar observations have been made by Bullock and other historians of earlier generations, but without the explicit resistance theory.[26]

African-American teachers did what other American teachers often do in periods when "reforms" are being imposed--subvert the changes by pretending to embrace them, take whatever financial support is being offered, and provide the education that seems to best meet the needs of students. Although John W. Davison lost his job, others, perhaps more astute, managed to tout their industrial offerings to state officials and philanthropists while most of their students were enrolled in literary courses. A true believer in industrial education for "primitive peoples," Thomas Jesse Jones, a white agent of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, and a team of inspectors conducted a major study of how well black land-grant schools were adhering to the agricultural and industrial curriculum. He was appalled:

> To both Jones and the Phelps Stokes Fund it was apparent in 1917 that the program of Negro vocational education outlined by Booker T. Washington, southern white supremacists, and northern philanthropy was a failure at the1890 land-grant schools.[27]

In rural black elementary schools across the South, something similar was happening. African-American teachers encouraged tomato clubs for girls and corn clubs for boys, and learning how to build sanitary privies was an important part of the curriculum. But, in addition, when the Jeanes teacher was out of sight, black teachers offered a basic curriculum not much different from the rural white schools down the road. As an example, Virginia Estelle Randolph, a rural black teacher and, later, Jeanes supervisor in Virginia, taught girls homemaking and boys how to make baskets from honeysuckle vines, but she also visited the local white school "to see what the teachers there were doing for their pupils," wanting to be "certain that her pupils were exposed to and given the best."[28]

Conclusion

Each of the three images reflects some of the

historical data, but the reality of the roles of the African-American cannot be encompassed by any of them. Part of the problem is that contemporary educational historians have tended to view industrial education simply as an imposition by powerful political and economic forces on African-American schools and teachers. However, the gulf between academic and industrial education, so apparent to contemporary historians, was not as clear to black teachers of the period. We sometimes ignore the fact that even W. E. B. DuBois, in his famous challenge, "On Mr. Booker T. Washington and Others," did not engage in a wholesale commendation of industrial education.[29] Long before the southern educational campaign and Booker T. Washington and the Tuskegee Machine, some black teachers endorsed industrial education.[30] And, as Thomas K. Jones' 1993 dissertation demonstrates effectively, what appears on the surface to be African-American opposition to industrial education was in reality usually opposition to the racist accommodation of Booker T. Washington.[31]

Without much regard for logical niceties, African-American teachers were often able to merge industrial and academic curricula in everyday practice and to separate desirable goals of industrial and agricultural education from the worst of its racial bias. The rhetoric of the Jeanes teachers reflects the country life movement and the pedagogical progressives of the period more than the language of Jim Crow. The slogans found in the reports of the Jeanes teachers are: "'life related activities,' 'socially useful projects,' 'action research,' 'moral and spiritual values,' 'teacher evaluation,' and the like."[32] Black teachers, like teachers generally, were able to understand and work within the compromises that constitute the American public school curriculum.

Notes

1. J. L. M. Curry, "Education in the Southern States," Proceedings of the Second Capon Springs Conference, p. 18.

2. William H. Baldwin, "The Present Problem of Negro Education, Industrial Education," Proceedings of the Second Capon Springs Conference, (1898), p. 68.

3. Walter Hines Page, Proceedings of the Seventh Conference for Education in the South, (1904), p. 105.

4. Hoke Smith, "Popular Education as the Primary Policy of the South," Proceedings of the Fifth Conference for Education in the South, (1902), p. 43.

5. Clarence Karier, "American Educational History: A Perspective," unpublished paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern History of Education Society, Atlanta, (November 12, 1971).

6. Donald Spivey, Schooling for the New Slavery, Black Industrial Education, 1868-1915 (Westport CT: Greenwood Press, 1978).

7. Henry Allen Bullock, A History of Negro Education in the South from 1619 to the Present (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1970).

8. James D. Anderson, The Education of Blacks in the South, 1860-1935 (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1988).

9. John R. Wennersten, "The Travail of Black Land-Grant Schools in the South, 1890-1917," Agricultural History 65 (1991).

10. Patricia Albierg Graham, Community and Class in American Education, 1865-1918 (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1974), p. 16.

11. Negro Public Schools, Independent, 74 (July 25, 1912) In Wayne E. Fuller, "The Teacher in the Country School," Donald Warren (ed.), American Teachers: Histories of a Profession at Work (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1989), p. 103.

12. North Carolina Biennial Report of the State Agent of Negro Rural Schools, 1917.

13. Robin Morgan, Going Too Far: The Personal Chronicle of a Feminist (New York: Vintage Books, 1968).

14. Peter McLaren and Rhonda Hammer, "Critical Pedagogy and the Postmodern Challenge: Toward a Critical Postmodernist Pedagogy of Liberation," Educational Foundations 3 (Fall, 1989), p. 45.

15. Dan C. Lortie, Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1975).

16. Leo M. Pavrot, "Negro Education in the South," Rural Education in the South, Bulletin of the Department of Rural Education, National Education Association, (February, 1930), p. 17.

17. Ibid, p. 20.

18. Ibid.

19. The Jeanes Story: A Chapter in the History of American Education, 1980-1968 (Jackson, MS: Southern Education Foundation, 1979), p. 65.

20. Spivey, p. 17.

21. Jeanes, p. 16.

22. Anderson, p. 133.

23. Ibid., pp. 119-121.

24. Wennersten, p. 54.

25. Ibid.

26. Bullock, p. 165.

27. Thomas Jesse Jones, et al., Negro Education: A Study of the Private and Higher School for Colored People in the United States, Bureau of Education Bulletin, no. 39 (Washington: 1916). In Wennersten, pp. 60-61.

28. Jeanes, p. 25.

29. W. E. B. DuBois, The Souls of Black Folk (The New American Library, Inc., 1903/1969).

30. Earle H. West, "The Harris Brothers: Black Northern Teachers in the Reconstruction South, The Journal of Negro Education, 48 (1979), pp. 135-36.

31. Thomas Kirkman Jones, "The Debate Over African-American Industrial Education, 1901-1914: A Post-Revisionist Historical Case Study," unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, (1993).

32. Jeanes, p. 59.

PAULO FREIRE'S INFLUENCE ON THE COMMUNITY OF FAITH, THROUGH RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

John M. Townsend
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

The focus of this paper is Paulo Freire's approach to Religious Education based on the social sciences. Like Dewey, one of Freire's means of reconstructing society has been found in the use of the institution and authority of the Church. Freire's use of the social-science approach (Burgess, pp. 127-165), which is radicated in the teaching-learning process, accepts the content of theology and inserts it, as pedagogically appropriate, into the approach. Harold Burgess in his book, An Invitation to Religious Education, describes this approach:

> The social-science theoretical approach to religious education is rooted in the teaching-learning process. As a religious education theory it sustains a value-free relationship to theology, the content of theology being accepted and inserted, as appropriate, into the approach. Practices generated from within the social-science approach have a high degree of specificity to individual situation; they flow from the deliberative effort of the religion teacher to use environment factors in the here-and-now learning process to effect selected, behaviorally defined, student learning outcomes (Burgess, pp. 15-16).

Paulo Freire is considered an interested and influential educationist in this theoretical approach. He is probably one of the most influential writers in the field of education that Brazil has ever produced. His writings meld educational situations with such issues as religious institutions and religious practices, poverty, oppression, employment issues, violence, health care, housing, food, the environment, and the community and politics. An overview of his writing quickly point the reader to themes of "The Community, the Family, and Culture."

Paulo Freire, A Short Biography

Paulo Freire was born in Recife, Piaui, a port city of about 2.6 million people in the northeast of Brazil; a place considered one of the world's most poverty-stricken areas, scorched by recurrent droughts. It was through his parents' extreme sacrifice during the Great Depression that Freire received his basic education. In those difficult days, Paulo fell behind his classmates and was interpreted as being mildly retarded. Hunger, Freire now says, was the true cause of his two year delay in school, which he made up very rapidly once the family situation improved a little (Jerez and Hernandez-Pico, p. 29).

After studying philosophy and law at the University of Recife, Freire worked some years as a labor union lawyer. It was during this time that Freire became interested in adult literacy. He organized and took part in leading adult education seminars for the workers, members of the unions, living in the slums. Many of these programs met in churches (principally in Catholic, but also in some Protestant). In the late 1950's and early 1960's, Freire launched various adult literacy campaigns that met with good success. Again, he solicited meeting places in churches. He also urged the Church to incorporate his literacy programs into the religious education programs of the local parish. Freire's programs met with so much success that in 1963, the Minister of Education of the Goulart government adopted Freire's methods for a Brazil-wide literacy campaign (Jerez and Hernandez-Pico, pp. 29-30).

During the 1964 military coup, Freire was jailed and later exiled from Brazil as a "subversive of the democratic order" (Jerez and Hernandez-Pico, p. 30). The traditional Church, in order to not agitate the military government, also denounced Freire's programs. His literacy campaigns were shelved and much of his work destroyed. For a while Freire worked in Chile, with the United Nation's Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; and with the Chilean Institute of Agrarian Reform (ICIRA). In 1969, he was a visiting professor at Harvard University.

Freire returned from exile to Brazil in the late 1970's. After his return the University of Recife awarded him the honorary degree of Doctor of Pedagogy. He taught Philosophy of Education at the University of Recife and at the Pontifical Catholic University in Sao Paulo, among other institutions. During the 70's and early 80's he spent much of his time as a consultant with the World Council of Churches in Geneva, focusing upon educational problems in the underdeveloped nations (Townsend, 1986). In the late 80's he became Minister of Education for the City of Sao Paulo with the opportunity to improve one of the largest school districts in the world.

Paulo Freire and Religious Education

Paulo Freire, like Dewey, saw the role of the church within society as a medium for the influencing the restructuring of the society. The institutional church's religious education programs were seen by Freire as being irrelevant, but with the possibility of relevancy if they are revolutionized within the context of the social history of the people.

> We will open this essay by making a flat statement: If you want to discuss either the Churches, or education, or the Churches' work in education, you must remember that they are situated in real history. For the Churches are not timeless abstractions, but institutions inserted into history; education too takes place in the flow of history; similarly, the churches' educational efforts are always conditioned by the concrete, historical reality into which the Churches are plunged. Once we grasp the import of that statement, we can never again imagine the Churches--or education, either--being "neutral" toward history (Freire, October 7, 1972, p. 15).

Though an educationist by profession and training, Freire often challenges the Church in Latin America (and world wide) in the field of theology and he challenges the Church's educational practice based upon theology. Freire has been warmly received by segments of the Catholic Church and various Protestant groups. Other segments of the Catholic Church and other Evangelical groups have seen Freire as a humanist and a marxist revolutionary. Much of what Freire has written and taught has found its way into prominence in educational--both the secular and religious--circles in Latin America and Africa.

Freire's Theology

Obviously, in this short space, a complete analysis of Freire's theology is impossible. A strong secular influence on the liberation theology movement of Latin America, Freire does not see himself as a theologian: "I am not a theologian but merely an onlooker intrigued by theology, which has indelibly marked what my pedagogy seems to be developing in to" (Freire, December, 1970, The Third World and Theology, p. 14).

Dedicated to the development of under classed peoples in the third world, Freire calls for theologians to take the part of those who are less fortunate, economically, in society. He calls for theologians to make themselves men of the Third World and to "steep themselves in that Third World" (Freire, December, 1970, p. 14). Freire calls for theologians to base their theology "on a profound and prophetic thrust of the Christian message" (Freire, December, 1970, The Third World and Theology, p. 13).

But what is this profound message that Freire calls one to--it is a message of humanization. Freire denies the traditional evangelical Christian message and in its place puts a humanistic, marxist theory of power.

> The true humanization of man cannot be brought about in the interiority of our minds; it has to take place in external history. If objective reality keeps man from being humanized, then he should change that reality.
>
> I am convinced that we as Christians have an enormous task to perform, presuming that we are capable of setting aside our idealistic myths and in that way, sharing in the revolutionary transformation of society, instead of stubbornly denying the extremely important contribution of Karl Marx (Freire, December, 1970, Letter to a Young Theology Student, pp. 11-12).

Freire calls for man to be a re-creator of his world. His first requirement of knowing how to hear the Word of God is a willingness to dedicate oneself to the liberation of man. Salvation has to be achieved through a praxis.

> They (man) must make themselves subjects, agents of their salvation and liberation. ...just as the Word became flesh, so the Word can be approached only through man. Theology has to take its starting point from anthropology (Freire, December, 1970, Letter to a Young Theology Student, p. 12).

Paulo Freire calls for a re-ordering of political, social and economic structures within his theology--a theology of revolution. If through the application of his theological premiss violence occurs, so much the better for the overturning of an "oppressive establishment." For him, "The violence of the oppressed is not really violence at all, but a legitimate reaction: it is an affirmation of one who no longer fears freedom, who knows that it is not a gift but a conquest" (Freire, December,1970, "The Third World and Theology", p. 14).

The Church and Its Educational Ministry

Paulo Freire sees the educational ministry of the Church in light of two key words: conscientizacao (conscientization) and praxis. The term, conscientization refers to learning to perceive social, political, and economic contradictions, and to take actions against the oppressive elements of reality (Freire, 1970, Pedagogy of the Oppressed). Freire sees these processes as integral parts of the educational ministry of the church. It is through the process of conscientization that the individual within the body can become a free and valiant Christian. Only through this restructuring of reality can the educational programs of the church be of value to man as he becomes a Third World citizen. For man within the context of the church's educational structure must be a political being.

> Those who want the church and its educational work to be neutral are either totally "innocent" (naive) in their understanding of the Church and of history, or they are "astute" and are just concealing their real views. Both groups as a matter of fact, by wanting the Church to adopt such an impossible neutrality toward history, toward political activity, are themselves taking a political stand--in favor of the dominating classes and against the dominated classes (Freire, 1972, p. 15).
>
> There are other, more valiant Christians, though, who--some renouncing their religious faith and some not renouncing it--become committed to the cause of liberating the dominated classes (Freire, 1972, p. 18)

Praxis, for Freire, is the process of liberation: "Liberation is a praxis: the action and reflection of men upon their world in order to transform it" (Freire, Pedagogy of the Oppressed, 1970, p. 66). This praxis comes only through dialogue between subjects within this world. It is this problem-posing education that changes the function of the traditional teacher-student relationship.

> The teacher is no longer merely the one-who-teaches, but one who is himself taught in dialogue with the students, who in turn while being taught also teach. They become jointly responsible for a process in which all grow. In this process, arguments based on "authority" are no longer valid; in order to function, authority must be on the side of freedom, not against it. Here, no one teaches another, nor is anyone self-taught. Men teach each other, mediated by the world, by the cognizable objects (Freire, Pedagogy of the Op-

pressed, 1970, p. 67).

For Freire, the Church in its educational program cannot speak of sin, of eternal fire or of damnation. Most of all the educational process cannot be missionary, neither in its message nor in the sense of who the teacher is. For if the Church speaks the traditional message of the Gospel, according to Freire, the popular masses find themselves "immersed in the culture of silence". This silence alienates the masses from the possibility of transcendence to a better world--a changed and changing world (Freire, October 7, 1972, p.20).

Teachers in his system cannot normally be from the First World, unless they pass through what Freire describes as another Passover, or Easter, and be reborn as a Third World man (Freire, December, 1970, p. 12).

> . . . any group of "outside educators" who have grown up, lived and studied, in a privileged situation, must "die as a class" and be reborn in consciousness--learning always even while they teach, and working always "with" (not "on") the nations and the people that invite their aid ("collaboration," as opposed to "cultural invasion," is the crucial term) (Freire, 1978, p. 4).

Freire ignores his own admonition in the book, Pedagogy in Process, and goes about telling how one should set up a pedagogical basis in a Third World country that has less educational opportunities than those which Freire had. His book reflects one cultural bias being placed upon another culture, even if they are both generally Third World in nature (though Brazil has been classified by some as a Second World culture).

There are two strong points which Freire's pedagogical structure of educational ministry has for today's Church. The first is the place of "love" within the educational process. The second is the seeking of alternatives to that method which he terms the "banking" concept of education.

Love for Freire is an act of courage and because it is of courage, it calls us to commit ourselves to our fellow man. It is through love that we as teachers are able to find a better pedagogical model for teaching within the religious context, to enter into dialogue with those who are less aware of the religion (i.e., Christianity). "Dialogue cannot exist, however, in the absence of a profound love for the world and for man" (Freire, 1970, Pedagogy of the Oppressed, p. 77).

For Freire, love should be revolutionary. Freire's model of the revolutionary love may be open to question by some within the Church, for the role model for this concept is not Jesus Christ, but the marxist revolutionary, Che Guevara. Guevara states of love:

> Let me say, with the risk of appearing ridiculous, that the true revolutionary is guided by strong feelings of love. It is impossible to think of an authentic revolutionary without this quality (Gerassi in Freire, 1970, Pedagogy of the Oppressed, p. 78 and in Freire, 1978, p. 4).

The second, "banking education," is an idea which most educationists strive to rise above in the classroom educational experience. Freire refers to "banking education" as an:

> . . . act of depositing, in which the students are the depositories and the teacher is the depositor. Instead of communicating, the teacher issues communiques and makes the deposits which the students patiently receive, memorize, and repeat . . . .

In the banking concept of education, knowledge is a gift bestowed by those who consider themselves knowledgeable upon those whom they consider to know nothing (Freire, 1970, Pedagogy of the Oppressed, p. 58).

These two concepts, "banking education" and revolutionary love are coming into prominence in the writings of progressive (liberal) religious educators both in the Third and First Worlds. Increasingly, in the liberation theology movement, Freire's concept of education within the Church is being thrown up against traditional models of learning and both are found wanting.

PARTIAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

Burgess, H.W. (1975). An invitation to religious education. Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press.

Freire, P. (October 7, 1972). "The educational role of the churches in Latin America", Pasos, 9. In Division of Latin America, U.S.C.C., Paulo Freire. (1977). Washington, DC: LADOC.

Freire, P. (December, 1970). "Letter to a young theology student", Perspectivas de Dialogo. In Division of Latin America, U.S.C.C., Paulo Freire. (1977). Washington, DC: LADOC.

Freire, P. (December, 1970). "The Third World and theology", Perspectivas de Dialogo. In Division of Latin America, U.S.C.C., Paulo Freire. (1977). Washington, DC: LADOC.

Freire, P. (1978). Pedagogy in process: The letters to Guinea-- Bissau. (Carmen St. John Hunter, Trans.). New York: Seabury.

Freire, P. (1970). Pedagogy of the Oppressed. (M.B. Ramos, Trans.). New York: Seabury.

Gerassi, John, ed. (1969). Venceremos -- The speeches and writings of Che Guevara. New York: Macmillan.

Jerez, C. & Hernandez-Pico, J. (August-September, 1971). "Cultural action for freedom", Estudios Centro Americanos. In Division of Latin America, U.S.C.C., Paulo Freire. (1977). Washington, DC: LADOC.

Townsend, J.M. An analysis of the current status of the ministry of religious education in the state of Sao Paulo. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1986.

THE EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY OF MAO ZEDONG FROM 1949 TO 1976

Hanfu Mi
Georgia Southwestern College

Mao Zedong, one of the most extraordinary political figures in this era, played a crucial part as a chief engineer of arguably one of the most unique and provocative approaches to modern education. The purpose of this paper is to discuss the guiding principles of the educational philosophy that Mao Zedong advocated for Chinese education from 1949 to 1976. The presentation of the content is organized into five sections and analyzed in the broadest context of societal development. The first part provides some introductory background to Mao's educational thoughts. The second part focuses on Mao's educational principles. The next two parts discusses Mao's educational administration and curriculum. The last part presents Mao's views on teachers, students, and intellectuals.

Mao Zedong has left his indelible imprint on virtually every sector of Chinese society including military strategy, political and economic affairs, and educational policy and practice. In his lifetime, he played many important roles, such as guerrilla leader, statesman, soldier, poet, philosopher, and educator. It is in education that Mao may have the most lasting influence.

Mao was one of the few major political leaders who began his career as a school teacher. In fact, in July 1936, Mao spoke of a desire to be remembered simply as a teacher (Snow, 1971). He ascribed to education, a key role in China, the power to transform society. The main goal of his educational policy was to produce people who were both socialist-minded with the Marxist consciousness and Chinese culture and professionally competent in a certain field. In general, Mao Zedong's educational philosophy has played a major role in the attempt to unify, develop, and strengthen the People's Republic in this century (Hawkins, 1974).

Educational Principles

The founding of the People's Republic in 1949 made Mao a leader of the most populous nation in the world. However, both Mao and his new government faced staggering obstacles. Galloping inflation plagued the economy, the political structure was dysfunctional, and the educational system was unable to satisfy even the minimum literacy requirements. The foreign policies intensified internal social problems. Early in 1950, Mao signed a "Treaty of Friendship, Alliance, and Mutual Assistance" with the fraternal Soviet government, which led to a series of external and domestic complications.

During this period, Mao was not nearly as prolific as in previous years before the seizure of power. However, sufficient information is available to assess the direction and development of his educational philosophy. The focus of the new political and social situation after 1949 required some adaptation of previously stipulated pedagogical goals and aims. Policies in Chinese education, especially in higher education, underwent some shifts after 1949 in response to swings in Chinese policy, ideological debates, and leaders. The shifts were the result of trying to decide whether to view education as a party device to sustain revolutionary values or as a government instrument to promote modernization. The basic principles formulated by Mao both during the Jiangxi period in the 1920s and the Yenan period in the 1940s, when experience-based learning was so evident, eventually won out. The teaching methods primarily grew out of educational experimentation during the Yenan period.

Following the historic Long March in 1934-35, the Chinese Communists introduced an informal, experience-based educational system when Mao and the People's Liberation Army (PLA) established their base in North Shaanxi province. This system included drama and discussion groups, as well as classes offered in factories and the countryside. Political education, which stressed Mao's teachings, firm leadership, and the integration of theory with practice, characterized the curriculum. The basic teaching method was the enlightenment method, an inquiry process involving initial questions and group discussions to develop specific answers. Meanwhile, Mao wrote his essay "On Practice" in which he stated that practice takes precedence over theory. In 1949, the first tentative Chinese Constitution included a continued emphasis on experience-based learning by stressing practical technical and agricultural education in the "Common Program."

In the early 1950s, China declared war on illiteracy. Efforts were made to simplify the Chinese written language. Romanization was used to aid pronunciation of the Chinese written characters, which were also made easier by reducing the number of strokes. Nurseries, kindergartens, and primary and secondary school education were expanded. Vocational and specialized schools were opened. Rural farmers were encouraged to read and to create their own textbooks for farming.

With the Great Leap Forward in 1958 came decentralization of education, development of local curriculum, and opening of work-study schools. Professional teachers were not regarded as reliable revolutionaries but as petty bourgeoisie without a correct political point of view. Therefore, they were severely criticized for burying themselves in books or engrossing themselves in vocational work and not adhering to Mao's line.

In the early 1960s, revisionists attacked the economic failures. Educationally, they attempted to discredit Mao's experience-based programs. In response, on May 7, 1966, Mao issued the famous "Directive on Education" which served as the basis for all subsequent revolutionary activities in education. Later on in 1969, Mao also criticized the primary and secondary schooling cycle, and he suggested a more practical policy that included a reduction of the term. "It takes a total of sixteen, seventeen or twenty years for one to reach the university from primary school, and in this period one never has a chance to look at the five kinds of grain, to look at how the workers do their work, how peasants till their fields, and how traders do business. In the mean-

129

time, one's health is also ruined. Such an educational system is very harmful indeed" (Mao, 1969e).

The Cultural Revolution in 1966 closed all the universities. Workers, peasants, and local PLA Units started to run the schools. The down-to-the-countryside program was initiated and launched in 1968 to reform the schools and transfer educated personnel, including students and teachers, to the communes to apply their skills, to be reeducated, and to learn productive manual labor. Mao stated: "It is absolutely necessary for educated young people to go to the countryside to be reeducated by the poor and lower middle peasants. Cadres and other city people should be persuaded to send their sons and daughters who have finished junior or senior middle school, college or university to the countryside. Let us mobilize. Comrades throughout the countryside should welcome them" (Mao, 1970). The May 7 cadre schools combined manual labor with political study, a concept that would help to produce a classless society.

During this entire period from the founding of the People's Republic of China in 1949 to 1976 when Mao died, the Chinese educational principles were strictly based on Mao's most frequently quoted statement about educational theory and practice. He stated, "Our educational policy must enable everyone who receives an education to develop morally, intellectually and physically and become a well-educated worker with socialist consciousness."

Educational Administration

When they entered Beijing in 1949, Mao and his Party encountered all types of administrative problems. The Yenan Border Region government made earlier efforts to organize the peasantry and undoubtedly provided both Mao and the Party with valuable experiences in administration. Yenan had a well-organized government apparatus, school system, medical program, tax policy, and other civil organizations, all of which required some level of management and administration. Yet it was all on a small scale compared with the immense tasks facing the new government in 1949. With the founding of the People's Republic, large numbers of administrators had to be recruited to staff the many governmental and public positions throughout China, managers had to be found to fill administrative posts in the industrial sector, and a network had to be organized to efficiently administer a widespread educational system. The result in the long-run was that administration became more complex, requiring the services of a bureaucracy and presenting to Mao and the Party the spectre of bureaucratic excesses and red tape, a condition they had scrupulously sought to avoid while in the caves of Yenan. Mao could no longer, of course, exercise the degree of direct influence over administrative matters that he had while acting as leader of the Border Region government. These responsibilities proliferated to countless committees, governmental and Party organs (Oksenberg, 1971).

During this time, it is not surprising that Mao's statements are difficult to locate on a specific subject such as educational administration. Two major periods stand out as representing stages revealing Mao's continued concern with this issue. The first is associated with the Great Leap Forward in 1958 and the second with the Great Cultural Revolution beginning in 1966. During both movements Mao attempted to assert what he considered a series of revolutionary reforms designed to rectify counter-revolutionary tendencies in Chinese society. In both cases, opposition to his policies was strong and the movements became identified with political struggles. Nevertheless, Mao's vision of educational administration emerged most clearly during these campaigns. In the 1970s, educational administration more closely approximated Mao's ideals than at any time since the 1940s.

Of the numerous ministries established in 1949, at least four were directly related to education: Ministries of Culture, Education, Higher Education, and Health. Below the higher level of ministries, several committees and commissions existed complete with staff and line relationships (Tsang, 1968). The first period of policy-making at all levels witnessed a carry-over from the Yenan period and consisted of a political-military administrative network (Schurmann, 1968). Mao had been moving in this direction during the Chinese revolutionary civil war. The military (PLA) had been viewed as a "school" both to train administrative cadres as well as provide personnel to staff new positions as they developed. The administrative mix that Mao had achieved in earlier periods understandably underwent some change.

From 1949 to 1976, Mao constantly emphasized the importance of educational administration. He stated: "The running of education also depends on the cadres. Whether or not a school is well run is determined by the political level of its principal and Party committees. The principal and teaching staff of a school should serve the students, not vice versa."

Educational Curriculum

Curricula development assumed new proportions in 1949. Various textbooks had to be provided for all educational levels and the new political stance of the government had to replace that of the previous regime in the curriculum. The flexibility that allowed diversity in textbook writing largely disappeared in the early years of the People's Republic. Mao's position on this question appeared clearly only during the Great Leap Forward and the Cultural Revolution. From his statement during these two critical periods, it seems likely that he maintained earlier views on curricula development. Mao still considered the three questions concerning the control, content, and format of curricula development, but in a less detailed manner than previously. At any rate, it is possible to see the continuation of the conflict between professional, centralized curricula development and Mao's inclination to favor programs that involved decentralization and practicality.

In the year of 1957, Mao traveled to various cities in China and saw the state of education firsthand. He was dissatisfied to see that textbooks were uniformly compiled in Beijing and suggested that the individual provinces compile their own texts, specifically the compilation of agricultural texts (Mao, 1969a). Mao stressed that educational curriculum should be related to the needs of individual communities. He feared that education was being divorced from the practical needs of local regions and that this was true in the content of academic texts as well: "Material of instruction should bear a local character and some more local or indigenous teaching material should be used ... Some indigenous literature should be

taught and this also applies to natural science" (Mao, 1969a). Mao (1968) also recognized several problems in political teaching materials:

> Recently there has been a falling off in ideological and political work among students and intellectuals, and some unhealthy tendencies have appeared . . . It seems as if Marxism was once all the rage but is currently not so much in fashion. To counter these tendencies we must strengthen our ideological and political work. Both students and intellectuals should study hard. But in addition to the study of their specialized subjects, they must make progress both ideologically and politically which means they should study Marxism, current events, and political problems. Not to have a correct political point of view is like having no soul.

The relationship between politics, theory, and practice, and mental and manual labor was extremely important to Mao. Students in the rural areas were encouraged to work with the agricultural cooperatives and take part in production at least part of the day. Urban students were to either set up their own factories or work in existing factories to complement conventional subjects. This was to be universal for all schools and posed a direct threat to the existing dual-track education system (Mao, 1969d).

From 1949 to 1976, Mao made repetitive criticisms of the educational curricula. He stated, "At present there are too many courses of study in the schools, and the pressure is too great for the students--subjects are also not properly taught. The method of examination deals with the students as enemies and launches surprise attacks against them. This is disadvantageous to the development, with initiative and in a lively manner of the young people, morally, intellectually and physically."

Views on Teachers, Students, and Intellectuals

In 1949, both Mao and the Party had to rely initially on whatever educated and skilled personnel who were available. Mao had to devote considerable attention to maintaining good relations with educated students and intellectuals while at the same time attempting to modify their world outlook and general behavior. Even those intellectuals who considered themselves Marxists fell under fire because of their excessively theoretical approach to Marxism-Leninism and their inability to analyze and solve practical problems (Mao, 1969b). As for students and youth in general, Mao (1969c) was much more sympathetic and naturally held higher hopes for their academic and political development:

> Let me say a few words to the young people: 1. May they enjoy good health; 2. May they learn well; 3. May they work well. New China must care for her youth and show concern for the growth of the younger generation. Young people have to study and work, but they are at the age of physical growth. Therefore, full attention must be paid both to their work and study, and to their recreation, sports, and rest. The young workers and peasants, the educated youth, and the young people in the armed forces are heroic and energetic and well disciplined. Without them the cause of revolution and construction cannot be successful.

In this statement, Mao's earlier views and attachments to students again found expression. He saw in them the hope of a new China. He stated, "The world is yours as well as ours, but in the last analysis, it is yours. You young people, full of vigor and vitality, are in the bloom of life, like the sun at eight or nine in the morning. Our hope is placed in you . . . The world belongs to you. China's future belongs to you" (1966). Mao's thoughts even became known outside China, as rebellious European and American students began quoting Mao as an authority.

Mao (1969f) also encouraged teachers and students to learn from the common people as an educational experience. He stated:

> Strength comes from the masses. Without reflecting the demands of the masses nobody is equal to his job. One should learn knowledge from the masses, lay down policies and after that go back to educate the masses. Therefore, in order to be a teacher, one should first be a pupil. No teacher is not a pupil first. Furthermore, after becoming a teacher, one also must learn from the masses in order to understand how he stands in his own studies. That is why there are two branches of science--psychology and education--in the science of education. Those who have no knowledge of reality will be unable to apply what they have learned.

In a sense, Mao was recreating the genuine revolutionary way at least for most of China's educated youth. The hoped-for result would be a new type of intellectual who has mastered the skills of his field, integrated with the laboring people, achieved a high degree of political consciousness and dedication, and acquired the ability to adapt creatively to new conditions. The entire process is meant to represent a major step on the way to the eventual elimination of the conventional division of labor and roles that results in occupational groups such as teachers, students, intellectuals, and workers. Man in short, would be reaching the ideal expressed by Marx and Engels in which his roles could be diversified enough to enable him to "do one thing today and another tomorrow, to hunt in the morning, fish in the afternoon, . . . " (Marx and Engels, 1970).

References

Hawkins, J. N., Mao Tse-Tung and Education: His Thoughts and Teachings, Hamden, Connecticut: The Shoe String Press, Inc., 1974.

Mao, Z., "Re-Educating the Young (December 22, 1968)," in Jerome Ch'en (Ed.), Mao Papers: An Anthology with Bibliography, New York: Oxford University Press, 1970.

Mao, Z., "Summary of Talks to Heads of Education Departments and Bureaux of Seven Provinces and Municipalities (March 7, 1957)," Current Background, No. 888, August 22, 1969a, p. 7.

Mao, Z., "Give Serious Attention to the Discussion of the Film The Life of Wu Xun (1951)," Current Background, No. 891, October 8, 1969b, p. 15.

Mao, Z., "Talk at the Reception for the Presidium of the Second National Congress of the Youth League (June, 1953)," Current Background, No. 891, October 8, 1969c, p. 16.

Mao, Z., "Instruction on Part-Work, Part-Study (February, 1958)," Current Background, No. 891, October 8, 1969d, p. 29.

Mao, Z., "Talk at the Hangchow Conference (December 1965)," Current Background, No. 891, October 8, 1969e, p. 53.

Mao, Z., "Talk with the Nepalese Educational Delegation on Educational Problems (1964)" Current Background, No. 897, December 10, 1969f, p. 46.

Mao, Z., "On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People (February 1957)," Four Essays on Philosophy, Beijing: Foreign Languages Press, 1968, p. 79.

Mao, Z., Quotations of Mao Tse-tung, Beijing: Foreign Language Press, 1966, p. 288.

Marx, K., and F. Engels, The German Ideology, New York: International Publishers, 1970, p. 53.

Oksenberg, M. C., "Policy Making Under Mao: 1949-1968 - An Overview," in J. M. H. Lindbeck (Ed.), China: Management of a Revolutionary Society, Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1971, pp. 79-115.

Schurmann, F., Ideology and Organization in Communist China, 2nd ed., Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968, p. 308.

Snow, E., "A Conversation with Mao Tse-tung," Life, April 30, 1971, pp. 46-48.

Tsang, C., Society Schools and Progress in China, New York: Pergamon Press, 1968, p. 80.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MAJOR PARADIGMS FOR EDUCATIONAL REFORM IN OREGON

Bill Cowart
Western Oregon State College

Background

My presentation today should be viewed as a brief report on a number of major activities going on in the State of Oregon and I will discuss several of these activities during the course of my presentation. For now it is simply important to note that educational reform in Oregon represents a broad range of activities that impact governmental agencies and educational institutions at all levels. This is an attempt to report on what I have defined as the major elements of this reform effort and the story of how it is happening.

Initially, it is interesting to note that the thrust for reform in Oregon stems from a different motivation than that of Kentucky and other states whose initiative appears to have arisen from dissatisfaction with performance criteria such as low SAT scores for graduating seniors. Oregon students ranked first or second in the nation for the past eight or nine years. The motivation in Oregon appears to stem more from problems such as a poor transition from the school into the workplace.

I don't have a universal measure for the magnitude of educational reform projects currently underway across the country. Probably, if they will require a major reorganization of the entire public school curriculum, impact the admission requirements of higher education and require significant changes in teacher licensure, they should be considered to be major. Oregon falls in that category.

I am certain that there are a number of other states that have educational reform efforts of a similar magnitude in progress.

SOURCE MATERIAL

I have drawn my presentation primarily from both personal experience and documents which have been developed or are still in the process of development for a project regarding the implications which the reform movement has for teacher licensure in Oregon.

There are four principle documents which were utilized as resource material.

DOCUMENT I - Outlines the major paradigm shifts included within the reform legislation

DOCUMENT II - Elaborates on the shifts in the roles and responsibilities of teachers which are included within the reform legislation and attempts to tie them to the professional literature in the field

DOCUMENT III - Describes what teachers will need to know, be able to do, and be able to accomplish in Oregon's 21st Century Schools

DOCUMENT IV - (which is still in the process of development) will be a set of formal recommendations to the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission regarding the licensure of teachers for Oregon's 21st Century Schools

I am a co-author on Document I but a great deal of the total work on Documents I - IV has been done by Del Schalock who works in the Teaching Research Division at Western Oregon State College. There are also extracts from a paper prepared by Del Schalock and Joyce Reinke entitled, "The Oregon Initiative: Pursuing America's Choice for High Skill Schooling." This paper will become a chapter in a book, entitled Working Literacies:English Teaching for the New Workplace, edited by Mary Sue Gray and Steve Burnhardt.

These documents outline the process in far too much detail to be included in their totality in this presentation, but copies are available through the Office of Provost, Western Oregon State College, Monmouth, Or., 97361.

OREGON'S EDUCATIONAL REFORM IN PERSPECTIVE

- **It is comprehensive and systemwide.**
- **It calls for a shift in social attitudes toward schools.**
- **It requires broad-based partnerships.**
- **It is outcome-based.**
- **It dovetails with other major state initiatives within the State of Oregon.**
- **It dovetails with national goals and reform programs** such as Clinton's stated intention to support educational reform as a way of improving our nation's workforce and economic competitiveness. Oregon is also an active participant in such national reform efforts as the **New Standards Project** which is developing prototypes for a national student performance assessment system anchored to world-class outcome standards.

DEFINITIONS

Let me define two key terms which, I believe will be useful as we go through this material.

MAJOR (as used in reference to Major Paradigm) - refers to a change in role, responsibility or practice that is sufficiently great as to represent an essentially new role or practice for most teachers in most Oregon schools.

OUTCOME - I encountered multiple definitions of the term "outcome" as I worked my way through the reform literature. Mary Diez, President of AACTE, identified four different definitions which I think will be useful in distinguishing between the different uses of the term in the professional literature today.

"Outcome$_1$: Characteristics of systems or groups that meet some goal set by a school/district/ institution."
"Outcome$_2$: Quantitative expressions of group performance compared to a norm."
"Outcome$_3$: Individual student performance on a "specific task demonstration."
"Outcome$_4$: Individual student performance, overtime, givingevidence of the development of integrated, complex abilities."

Outcome$_4$ is the one which will be utilized within this paper.

PARADIGM CATEGORIES

A. CHANGES IMBEDDED IN THE STRUCTURE AND ORGANIZATION OF SCHOOLS

B. CHANGES EMBEDDED IN THE OUTCOMES EXPECTED FROM SCHOOLS

C. CHANGES EMBEDDED IN THE NATURE OF INSTRUCTION LEADING TO OUTCOME ATTAINMENT

D. CHANGES EMBEDDED IN THE NATURE OF ASSESSMENT AND RECORD KEEPING REQUIRED TO MONITOR AND REPORT PROGRESS TOWARD OUTCOME ATTAINMENT

E. CHANGES EMBEDDED IN EVALUATING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF A SCHOOL, AND IMPROVING A SCHOOL (OR A PROGRAM WITHIN A SCHOOL) WHEN IT IS LESS EFFECTIVE THAN DESIRED

F. CHANGES EMBEDDED IN THE PROFESSIONALISM OF TEACHING AND THE NATURE OF DECISION-MAKING WITHIN SCHOOLS

EXAMPLES OF PARADIGM SHIFTS WITHIN CATEGORIES

Changes imbedded in structure and organization of schools

From schools where individual teachers, textbooks, and standardized tests are central in determining what is to be learned by students, and the level to which it is to be learned...

To schools where the State Board of Education through an extensive process of public involvement in outcome definition and the setting of performance standards, has established the broad, culminating outcomes to be accomplished by students, and the level to which these outcomes are to be accomplished.

From schools organized on a grade-by-grade or course-by-course basis with individual teachers primarily responsible for helping students accomplish learning outcomes desired...

To schools organized to accommodate developmental levels of learners, with shared responsibility among teacher for helping students accomplish the desired outcomes from schooling.

From schools where students and their parents have few if any educational alternatives to turn to when learning is not proceeding as it should, and teachers/administrators having few resources to draw upon to help students who are having difficulty in learning...

To a system of schooling where challenging and appropriate alternative learning environments must, by statute, be made available to students who are not progressing satisfactorily in their learning, including the option of attending a Learning Center within one's district of residence or another school in a district of choice.

From a system of schooling where a classroom is seen as the primary environment in which school-based learning occurs...

To a system of schooling where the home, neighborhood, community and work place are seen as extensions of and partners in an exchange with classrooms as environments for school-based learning.

From a system of schooling where there are clear demarcations between grade levels in elementary, middle and secondary schools, and between secondary schools, community colleges and 4-year institutions are clearly defined and controlled by separate policy boards...

To a system of schooling where existing demarcations between levels and places of learning are blurred, with criteria for entry to andmovement between educational institutions and other environments for learning based largely on the assessment of student progress toward learning goals and the best fit educationally between progress, needs and opportunities for learning.

These are listed simply to serve as examples. There are 77 major paradigm shifts listed in Document I. When the reform agenda is fully implemented, the high school diploma will be replaced by:

1. the Certificate of Initial Mastery - CIM; and
2. the Certificate of Advanced Mastery - CAM.

Upon completing the CIM students should:

• have a general education background equivalent to, or that exceeds that which is currently expected of high school graduates;
• be able to apply their knowledge and skills at a level currently expected of high school graduates, but rarely achieved;
• be prepared to effectively and efficiently pursue a Certificate of Advanced Mastery.

Upon completing a CAM, students should be prepared to:

• enter some segment of the work force with a background of related workplace knowledge, skills and work experience;
• function competently in the major life roles likely to be faced as adults;
• pursue a technical education/training program, an

associate degree, or a baccalaureate degree if these are involved in a career preparation decision of choice.

All students completing a CAM with a career goal requiring a baccalaureate degree should be fully prepared to pursue such a degree, and students completing a CAM with a career goal requiring advanced technical training or an associate degree should be able to enter a 4-year higher education program with relatively little additional preparation.

THE CERTIFICATE OF INITIAL MASTERY

The Certificate of Initial Mastery covers the current grades K - 10, which includes students of ages four through sixteen. The curriculum of the CIM will "emphasize useful knowledge and complex performance, matched to real-world demands." Required outcomes include:

1. A CORE OF COMMON LEARNING
2. AN EMPHASIS ON MACRO-RATHER THAN MICRO-OUTCOMES wherein all students pursue goals for learning that can be accomplished only through several years of study, usually with several teachers working across subject areas.
3. DEVELOPMENTALLY BENCHMARKED OUTCOMES, wherein learning outcomes are defined for developmental benchmarks that span a number of years.
4. APPLIED PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES, wherein all students pursue learning that focus heavily on knowledge and skill application, and are demonstrated largely within the context of personally or socially meaningful problems and/or life role demands.
5. ADULT TRANSITION OUTCOMES, wherein all student pursue goals that contribute directly to their transition as young people to adulthood in an increasingly diverse and complex society, including preparation to pursue a CAM.
6. A SECOND LANGUAGE AS AN OUTCOME, wherein all students are expected to become proficient in two languages, one of which is English, and when English is not the primary language students are expected to develop and expand their capacity to use their native language.

THE CERTIFICATE OF ADVANCED MASTERY

The curriculum of the CAM will seek to extend the FOUNDATION outcomes required for the CIM, but the primary emphasis will be to help students make an effective transition to adulthood. "This includes preparation for productive employment in 21st century America and preparation to function competently in other life roles likely to be faced as an adult."

To make this transition to adulthood as effective and functional as possible, programs of study will be developed within six broad career pathways.

The career pathways are:

- ARTS AND COMMUNICATION
- BUSINESS AND MANAGEMENT
- HEALTH SERVICES
- HUMAN RESOURCES
- INDUSTRIAL AND ENGINEERING SYSTEMS
- NATURAL RESOURCE SYSTEMS

This area of the curriculum constitutes the most dramatic change from current practice and will require the greatest investment in curriculum redesign and faculty development.

As of this writing (September 1993) four ADVANCED APPLICATION outcomes, and advanced performance standards for the FOUNDATION outcomes required for the CIM, have been identified as required for a Certificate of Advanced Mastery.

The ADVANCED APPLICATION outcomes focus on

- applying information, resources and technology (with specific application to the career path being pursued);
- understanding systems and structures (with specific application to the career path being pursued);
- contributing as a citizen, and
- applying personal development strategies.

THE STORY

The story of how the current educational reform movement in Oregon originated and came to its current level of development, is interesting, apart from the magnitude of what is being attempted.

Until 1980, the state considered itself to be a successful, natural resource economy. State revenues were considered to be at acceptable levels, quality of life was a high state priority with extensive leadership. being exercised in areas of environmental protection such as the famous "bottle bill" to recycle empty drink cans and bottles, requiring merchants to redeem them for 5¢ @, increased air and water pollution standards, and the landmark decision which declared all Pacific coast beaches in Oregon to be public property, thereby protecting public access. Oregon is an international leader in the production of quality grass seed, and is a major producer of fresh and processed fruits and vegetables, wheat, and nursery products such as flowers, bulbs, Christmas trees, etc., and it continues to be one of the best timber growing regions in the world. Since 1980, things have changed. The timber industry reached a point where it could no longer compete, in its existing configuration, with timber produced in the South - pine trees grown in a thirty year cycle compared to the forty to fifty year cycle required for the Douglas Fir and timber being brought in from Canada and other global producers. Some heavy industry and manufacturing in areas such as furniture, electronics, and athletic equipment (Nike shoes) were present in Portland, but they were not the backbone of the economy. Of course, with the collapse of amajor segment of the economy, the state began to experience a serious shortfall in revenue. This had an effect at all levels of the economy but the major, long range impact will be in the rural areas where entire communities have been dependent upon the cutting, hauling, or processing of timber for jobs, as well as,revenue for schools, local government, etc. In fact, there are families that haveworked in the timber industry for four or five generations that now must be retrained and probably will

have to relocate closer to some urban center. There are only about three or four in the entire state and only one of them, Portland, is larger than 200,000 in population.

The process of expanding the economic base of the state began in the early 1980's and has realized some success. The electronics industry has grown. Agriculture remains relatively strong, and while there have been many lumber mill closures, the remaining mills have retooled and been computerized into a much more cost effective operation and the tourism industry has expanded.

During the course of these activities, some important statewide planning was initiated. It sought to develop benchmarks which were defined as measurable standards for progress. Two hundred seventy-two benchmarks have been listed which are divided into two categories: urgent and core.

I. CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

A. EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT - The urgent category includes the following. The percentage of children entering kindergarten meeting specific development standards for their age:

a. cognitive development
b. language and literacy development
c. physical well being
d. social/emotional development

B. TEEN PREGNANCY - pregnancy rate per 1,000 females ages 10-17

C. DRUG-FREE BABIES - percentage of infants whose mothers did not use

II. EDUCATION AND WORKFORCE PREPARATION

"to achieve measurably the best educated work force in the nation by the year 2000, and one equal to any in the world by 2010."

Educational skills will be identified for designated grades such as the 5th and 11th and the objective is to raise student achievement to 99% by the target years.

OTHER TARGETED AREAS INCLUDE:

III. Work force training
IV. Value-added products
V. Health and health care
VI. Air Quality
VII. Socially livable communities
VIII. Clean natural environment, and
IX. Government efficiency

So, the current educational reform movement arose out of this broader statewide effort even though the reform being considered in education is probably broader and deeper than what is being considered for any other social institution or service in the state.

A colleague commented to me on the phone a few weeks ago that we, as students of John Dewey, had failed to communicate Dewey's philosophy effectively. That may be the case, but Bill Drake, my major professor and a long time student of Dewey, expressed his conviction on many occasions, that in spite of Dewey's widespread recognition, his philosophy was not understood.

One example he repeatedly made was the inability of so many writers and educators to accurately differentiate between the teachings of Dewey and Rousseau. But whatever the judgment in this regard, I continue to see many of Dewey's concepts included within the current reform literature such as the strong emphasis on child development, the importance of relating learning to the personal experience of the child, and the development of a close relationship between the school, the community, and the workplace. None of these publications give Dewey adequate recognition or credit for the development of these concepts. Perhaps what this really means is that we are in the process of "reinventing" Dewey.

One interesting element in the development of the reform effort in Oregon is that the prime mover was Vera Katz, the Speaker of the House of Representatives for the Oregon legislature. Representative Katz was appointed to the Carnegie Forum in the mid-1980's and has carried the ideas developed through that Forum, and other Carnegie sponsored efforts, such as the National Center on Education and the Economy, and the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, back to Oregon and utilized them as her reform agenda.

Representative Katz was extremely successful in organizing the support for her reform agenda, and moved it through the Oregon Legislature with only limited opposition. It is important to note that she delayed implementation until the next legislative session which allowed her to pass the bill without a fiscal note so the taxpayers were not provided any information regarding the potential cost of the bill. All energy was put into the political process and proper steps were taken to insure that no individuals or groups would derail the process. This was done primarily by omission, they were simply not invited to participate in the process of developing the reform agenda. The teacher unions chose to it this one out and the State System of Higher Education made a decision to not take a formal stand against it.

The result was, what is referred to as the "Katz Bill," officially, House Bill 3565, entitled the "Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century," was passed into law in 1991. The problem which began to surface at that time, was the need to identify the major concepts included within the provisions of the bill, relate them to the literature and begin the process of relating these concepts to current practice in the field. The need was to determine which ones were well supported in existing curriculum theory, had been implemented in some format, and which ones were attractive from the standpoint of theory but would require a significant amount of developmental work prior to implementation. Secondly, it would be necessary to determine the magnitude of change (from current practice) that would be required to implement the reform agenda, as written. The purpose of these activities was to develop a source document to guide the development of an implementation plan for the professional educators who would be ultimately responsible for converting these concepts into educational programs for students. One year after the passage of the bill into Law, the Oregon State System of Higher Education began to be increasingly aware that the outcomes which were being developed for the Certificate of Advanced Mastery were not compatible with established college or university admission requirements. In an attempt to "bridge the gap" that had been developing between the Board of Higher Education and the Board of Education, which is responsible for all programs from Kindergarten through the community college level, the Board of Higher Education identified funding for a series of projects which would begin the process of

moving curriculum and administrative practice in higher education into a position to assist in the implementation of the reform agenda. Western Oregon State College submitted a proposal to study the implications of the reform agenda for teacher licensure. Specifically, the proposal would be directed toward identifying what teachers need to know, to be able to do, and be able to accomplish, to successfully teach in Oregon's School for the 21st Century. The project was funded at a modest level and, as originally conceived, was not intended to constitute a major study which would require almost two years to complete. However, during the development stages of the project, it became evident to the staff that it would not be possible to deal adequately with the teacher licensure issues without first developing one or more foundation documents which would identify the major components of the reform agenda, compare them to current practice, relate them to the professional literature in the field and determine which ones constituted major or minor paradigm shifts. It was visualized that the final product of the project would be a set of formal recommendations to the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission, who is responsible for teacher licensure in Oregon. A determination was also made by the project staff that the real purpose of the project was to provide the best judgment which the profession could provide to the Commission regarding what a teacher would need to know, be able to do, and be able to accomplish to be successful in Oregon's School for the 21st Century. In this context, it was stated, in advance, that no attempt would be made to limit the deliberations of the project to areas considered to be "politically correct" or "fiscally acceptable" to the public, the legislature, the classroom teacher's union or Schools of Teacher Education. It was also decided that for the recommendations to carry any weight they would need the support and endorsement of as broad a representation of the education community as possible. The project has been in process for a year and has involved more than one hundred fifty professional educators organized through an executive committee, to provide overall project guidance and direction, an editorial board composed of forty educators from all levels, whose function was to react to, change, approve or reject materials developed by the project staff, and a Teacher Education Design Team (eight to twelve members including representatives from the general public) from each institution in Oregon responsible for the preparation of teachers. There are a total of sixteen such institutions in Oregon.

The foundation documents are complete or will be completed within the next four months with the exception of Document II which will relate each of the seventy-seven major paradigm shifts to the professional literature in the field. Some important initial work has been done on Document II, however, it represents the most ambitious single component of the project and will require some additional time to complete. Document III will be completed this fall, along with Document IV.

Document I, which identifies the major paradigm shifts and relates them to current practice, is complete, and is rapidly becoming the foundation document for all agencies involved in implementing the reform agenda. There is a particular irony to this development. The Oregon reform agenda for its public schools will cost millions of dollars to implement, whether it is implemented through the infusion of new dollars or by the more tedious process of making a direct conversion of existing programs, resources and personnel with a minimum of assistance for professional development. Professional personnel within the state have debated and discussed little else for the past two years. Yet, the foundation document, which it appears, at this point, will serve as the principle guide for the implementation of the reform agenda was funded, after the fact, by an agency which had not even been invited to participate in the initial development of the reform legislation.

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Document I, Oregon's Design for 21st Century Schools and Its Implications for Teachers", Del Schalock and Bill Cowart, Western Oregon State College. Unpublished paper developed as a part of a teacher licensure grant from the Oregon State System of Higher Education, 1992-1993. A working document to establish an intellectual foundation for the redesign of teacher preparation and licensure in Oregon to accommodate the demands of the state's design 21st century schools. This document identifies seventy-seven major paradigm shifts included within H.B. 3565, Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century and relates them to current practice.

"Document II, The Elaboration of Shifts in the roles and Responsibilities of Teachers in Oregon's Design for 21st Century Schools", Del Schalock, Teaching Research Division, Western Oregon State College. Unpublished paper developed as a part of a teacher licensure grant from the Oregon State System of Higher Education, 1992-1993. A working document to identify the knowledge base needed for the redesign of teacher preparation and licensure and relate it to the literature. The material included within this document is organized around and indexed back to the paradigm shifts identified in Document I.

"Document III, Teaching in Oregon's 21st Century Schools: What Teachers Need To Know, Be Able To Do, and Be Able To Accomplish", Del Schalock, Teaching Research Division, Western Oregon State College. Unpublished paper developed as a part of a teacher licensure grant from the Oregon State System of Higher Education, 1992-1993. A working document directed toward identifying the functions which teachers need to perform in Oregon's 21st century schools. The functions identified in Document III are indexed back to the major paradigm shifts identified in Document I.

"Document IV, Guiding Principles for the Licensure of Teachers that Reflect the Demands of Oregon's Educational Act for the 21st Century", Del Schalock and Bill Cowart, Western Oregon State College. Unpublished paper developed as a part of a teacher licensure grant from the Oregon State System of Higher Education, 1992-1993. The study of the major paradigm shifts included within the Oregon Educational Reform Act for the 21st Century (Documents I & II) and the shifts in teacher roles and responsibilities as identified through the functions listed in Document III, lead to a set of conclusions about the licensure of teachers in Oregon. Document IV identifies these conclusions as principles or guidelines that should underly any new design for

teacher licensure in our state. They carry no assumptions about the specifics of a new licensure system, but they do carry the assumption that all of the principles should be reflected in the new system.

"The Oregon Initiative: Pursuing America's Choice for High Skill Schooling", Del Schalock, Western Oregon State College and Joyce Reinke, Oregon Department of Education. Prepared as a chapter to appear in a forthcoming book by Mary Sue Gray and Steve Burnhardt (Eds.), Working Literacies: English Teaching for the New Workplace.

"What are Outcomes?" Mary E. Diez, AACTE Briefs, August 30, 1993, One Dupont Circle, Suite 610, Washington, D.C.

NOTES

[1] "Document I, Oregon's Design for 21st Century Schools and Its Implications for Teachers", Del Schalock and Bill Cowart, Western Oregon State College. Unpublished paper developed as a part of a teacher licensure grant from the Oregon State System of Higher Education, 1992-1993.

[2]Ibid.

[3]"What are Outcomes?" Mary E. Diez, AACTE Briefs, p. 2, August 30, 1993, One Dupont Circle, Suite 610, Washington, D.C.

[4]"Document I, Oregon's Design for 21st Century Schools and Its Implications for Teachers", Del Schalock and Bill Cowart, Western Oregon State College. Unpublished paper developed as a part of a teacher licensure grant from the Oregon State System of Higher Education, 1992-1993.

[5]Ibid, pp. 7-9.

[6]"The Oregon Initiative: Pursuing America's Choice for High Skill Schooling", Del Schalock, Western Oregon State College and Joyce Reinke, Oregon Department of Education. Prepared as a chapter to appear in a forthcoming book by Mary Sue Gray and Steve Burnhardt (Eds.). Working Literacies: English Teaching for the New Workplace, p. 6.

[7]Ibid., p. 7.

[8]Ibid., pp. 7-8.

[9]Ibid., pp. 9-10.

THE HEDGE SCHOOLS AND EDUCATION IN THE AMERICAN SOUTH

Karl J. Jost
The University of Tennessee

During the last decade the educational community of America and the European nations have been bombarded with calls for reform, change, and restructuring to prepare Western society for the realities of the twenty-first century. That some dramatic change is afoot in Western society is clear but the nature and direction of that change is not clear at all and there seems to be a malaise within all of our social institutions, not just education, resulting in rather frantic casting about for new configurations and assumptions to accommodate this directionless change. The assurities of predictions about the twenty-first century seem to be decreasing as the Balkans erupt yet again, nations, and mega-nations undergo dramatic turmoil and disintegration, and fundamentalist religion experiences a resurgence in both the Islamic world and the millennial enthusiasms in the Christian world. Increasingly in the last decade of the twentieth century, the twenty-first century is beginning to look suspiciously like the nineteenth century and this paper will address one aspect of dramatic change in social institutions, to wit: How do traditional educational establishments react when the demand for dramatic cultural or structural change is suddenly thrust upon them? This research explores the Gaelic Hedge Schools established to fight the incursion of English education foisted upon the Celtic cultural zones from the thirteenth century onward. I further hypothesize that the very creative and successful reaction of the Hedge School is being duplicated throughout America, particularly in the American South by the rise of evangelical and fundamentalist Christian schools as a defense against modernism and the technical secularization of American culture. These schools are now found across almost all denominational lines to include Catholic, Jewish, mainline Protestant, Evangelical Conservative, Fundamentalist Protestant, and Islamic educational enterprises, all having roughly similar concerns about the state and direction of modern American education.

The overarching goal of English imposition of their education upon the Celts was to end the tribalism of the Celts in Scotland and Ireland in particular and integrate those regions into the emerging English-dominated British empire. With the assistance of electronic technology, tribalism is again emerging world-wide, as pointed out so cogently by Daniel Patrick Moynihan's book, Pandaemonium, and Joel Kotkin's book, Tribes: How Race Religion and Identity Determine Success in the New Global Economy. Race, gender and class seem to be increasingly superseded by tribalism and religion as instigators for social ills and many aspects of multiculturalism are very encouraging of the ethnicity and tribalism within the nation state. Increasingly it appears the center is not holding and the tribes quickly begin to educate according to the cultural history and norms of their particular groups. Whether this reemergence is for good or for ill, we simply do not know. Kotkin argues that economically and educationally, the tribe is exampled by the medieval city state and the modern mini-dragon states of Asia are far more effective units than the large national state, while Daniel Moynihan does not see much good coming out of tribalism at all. If, as many authors argue, we learn within cultural nets, then any educational model that enhances a culture's net has a strong chance of real success often enhanced by facing a common foe. Both the Celts of the Celtic fringe or Europe and the Celts of the American southern highlands shared that sense of a 'cultural net' and a common foe and reacted creatively through their educational systems, but with considerably different outcomes, in Europe and America. It was in America that the English educational model won and it is in the Celtic fringe of Europe where the indigenous educational culture not only survives but is still considered superior to the English model with the Welsh being labeled the schoolmasters of England and the Scottish Ministry of Education being considered superior to its English counterpart and the Irish school system a quite successful example of bilingual and bicultural education for the good of both the technical life of their citizens and the cultural life of the nation.

The historical and sociological data for both Medieval and English conquest periods in the Celtic zones, when contrasted with the educational attitudes and attainments of Celtic refugees to the American Southern Highlands, are completely contradictory, running the gamut from the brilliance and superiority of the Celtic Hedge schools to the total decadence of these schools. The same continuum exists for the Celt in the American Southern Highlands. Not only is the data contradictory, various sources locate on almost every point of the continuum between the two extremes. A brief outline of these positions is represented by Patrick John Dowling's book The Hedge Schools of Ireland, where he makes much of comments by Edmund Campion in the early 16th Century, and the Clanricarde Memoirs arguing that the Hedge school was merely an evolutionary development of a very unique phenomenological learning style that emerged from Medieval Celtic education and, in fact, produced excellent scholars, many superior to the best scholarship produced by the academies of the conquering English, and even Oxford and Cambridge (Dowling, John, The Hedge Schools of Ireland, p. 3-5). A Southern Highlands example of this tradition would be the educational development of one thirty-five year-old rural Tennessean who had never been to school a day in his life but whose mother and grandmother purchased for him every classical book they could find at garage sales and second hand library sales and the young man, who had never attended school, eventually emerged as one of the best classical scholars in the Nation and was given a Ph.D. by Vanderbilt in English Literature, still with no school attendance. A middle position is offered by William Carleton in his book of a series, Traits and Stories of the Irish Peasantry, published in 1836. Carleton argues that the Hedge schools were excellent but the teachers were decadent and their decadence met with

approval among the oppressed Irish peasantry (Carleton, Traits and Stories of the Irish Peasantry, p. 135).

> It is an indisputable fact that Hedge school masters were as superior in literary knowledge and acquirements to the class of men who are now engaged in the general education of the people, as they were beneath them in moral and religious character (Carleton, p. 145).

Parents, whom he interviewed, applauded the masters' drunkenness, arguing that it was a real assist to insight, creativity and deliverance of their lessons. This tradition in Appalachia could be represented by the Foxfire schools, Berea College, Alice Lloyd College, and other institutions where education began with the assumption of the rightness and goodness of the Celtic culture and the emotional predilections of that culture toward a learning style. I in no way suggest that these schools were replete with drunken and debauched academics, but that the need of the student for connectedness to many aspects of their cultural daily life was acknowledged in their academic career. Celtic education from the early Medieval period to the present has been noted for its cultural egalitarianism with a disdain for the arrogant scholar who sets him-or herself above the people being taught. A third view is represented by Grady McWhiney's 1988 book entitled Cracker Culture in which he argues that the Celtic culture in the English penal times had disintegrated into almost complete debauchery, what viable education still existed disintegrated when the refugees from English tyranny migrated first to the Southern lowlands and then purposefully escaped English colonial culture by fleeing into the Highlands of Appalachia (McWhiney, Cracker Culture, p. 212-214). If one strips the romanticism current in sociology directed toward the Southern Appalachian white, one would find that they are educationally and motivationally bereft by any criterion one chooses to apply. He notes that American Northerners have commented consistently on the vehement anti-intellectual bias of both the Southern upper class and the Southern peasantry. McWhiney argues that peasantry is the correct term, that the yeomanry of the North and the aristocracy of the coastal South are not adequate descriptors of the population of the Appalachian Highlands. Horace Kephart in Our Southern Highlanders reinforces this anti-intellectual bent and almost all the sociological treatments, particularly since the 1930's and New Deal, attempt to ameliorate the condition of the Southern Highlands with the assumption of meager intellectual and academic attainments of the Southern Highlander. They place the blame on the larger society oppressing these people and that with proper treatment, they can be repaired to be functioning consumers in middle-class America. The sociological literature echoes the earlier historical literature, to wit: We look at the brilliant individual attainments of certain Appalachian Highlanders who have moved into the mainstream of American society, we argue that the children are as capable as any other children but the training of teachers has been grossly inadequate and they are incapable. The University of Tennessee's Summer School of the South was directly involved in this theory of Appalachian education. Finally the revisionist argument from conservative sociologists is that the bright and the capable of Appalachia are already in Cincinnati, Ohio, and that the remainder of the population is a culture in disintegration and not much can be done to affect the statistics of educational attainment for the remaining Appalachian population. Traditionally this sociological literature has been very value loaded with a bias in favor of the mainstream of American culture, with little research done on the possibility that the Appalachian white may have looked at that larger culture and simply rejected it. Weller's Yesterday's People, Caudill's Night Comes to the Cumberland, and Caudill's The Watches of the Night are useful exceptions to that value bias.

With that outline, beginning with the earliest and most positive literature, are three descriptions of oral Hedge school: The Jesuit scholar Edmund Campion who, about 1570, wrote Two Bokes of the Histories of Ireland, which have been characterized as a plea for decent education in Ireland, and Ulrich Bourke, Marquis of Clanricarde's, comments in 1722 and the Metrical Dindsenchas.

To begin with Campion:

> Without either preciptes or observation of congruite they speake Latten like a vulgar language, learned in theire common scholes of Leechcraft and have, whereat they begynn children, and hold on sixtene or twentie yeares, connyng by roate the aphorismes of Hipocrates and the civill institutes, and a fewe other paringes of thos twoe faculties. I have seene them wheare they kepte schole, term in one chamber, goveling upon couches of strawe, theire bookes at theire noses, theselves lying flatt prostrate, and so chante owt their lessons by peecemeale, being the most part lustie fellowes of 25 yeares and upwards. (Campion, Two Bokes of the Histories of Ireland, p. 24).

Campion's Histories have been characterized as a plea for decent education in Ireland. The English perceived Irish education as primitive but native Irish writers state the general level of culture was high in 1570 before the Elizabethan wars destroyed the normal life of the country.

The Dindsenchas is a collection of legends connected with the origin of Irish place names and the legends are in both prose and verse. Most of the prose versions are in Revue Celtique, edited by Whitley Stokes. According to Stokes, the works are Fourteenth or Fifteenth Century but the collections are from the Eleventh or Twelfth. One of the verses, the Bend Etair II, contains a reference to preparing for an exam while in bed.

BEND ETAIR II

Cic dorcha dam im lepaid,
cid scel fromtha is fir-deccair,
imreil fri solad slimda
cach romag cach rodindgna.

Though it be dark to me in my bed,
though it be a tale of testing and difficult indeed,
[yet] illustrious with profit of laudation
is every famous plain, every famous fortress.

(Gwynn, Edward, "The Metrical Dindshenchas,"

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Royal Irish Academy,
Todd Lecture Series, 10, pt. 3 (1913), 110-111.)

This presumed eleventh or twelfth century source is an oral survival in learning methodology well into the literate period in Celtic culture and is reinforced by Sixteenth, Eighteenth, and Nineteenth Century descriptions of the same method of teaching, surviving at least to the early Twentieth Century in the remote Celtic (Gaelic) speaking areas of Western Ireland and Scotland.

The description of an oral school found in the Clanricarde Memoirs was partially ghost-written by an Irish antiquarian Thomas O'Sullevane. This source description is the only Harley MS Index entry for O'Sullevane and date notes at the beginning of the Codicile by various readers offer the following dates: "600 years old" in 1776, "thirteen hundred years old," "Probably 800 years old" in 1802 (Harley MS Index, Codicile 432). So 1000 to 1100 A.D. is the date of this description. Quoting from O'Sullevane's entry in Ulrich Bourke's "Memoirs of the Rt. Hon. the Marquis of Clanricarde," (1722),

> O'Sullevane points out first the fundamental difference between these schools and those in other parts of Europe, namely that they were conducted 'by certain families or tribes in every large territory.' The aims of the education given were 'reading well, writing the mother tongue, and a strong memory.' The school was situated 'in the solitary recess of a garden, or within a sept or inclosure, far out of reach of any noise.' The building was 'a snug, low hut, with beds in it,' without windows and lit only by candlelight. The students were divided into classes, 'wherein a regard was had to everyone's age, genius, and the schooling had before, if any.' The professor appointed a subject, with detailed instructions as to the use of 'rhimes. . . syllables, quartans, concord, correspondence, termination and union, each of which were restrained by peculiar rules.' The students worked on their allotted themes 'each by himself upon his own bed, the whole day next day in the dark, till, at a certain hour in the night, lights being brought in, they committed it to writing.' They then gathered 'into a large room, where the master waited, each scholar gave in his performance, which being corrected, or approv'd of-(according as it required), either the same or fresh subjects were given against the next day. . . O'Sullevane is at pains to explain that the curious practice of composing in the dark was 'doubtless to avoid the distraction which light and the variety of objects represented thereby commonly occasions. This being prevented, the faculties of the Soul occupied themselves solely upon the subject in hand.' The course was long 'six or seven years before a mastery or the last degree was conferred.' (McGrath, p. 53-54).

The mind-set necessary for a literate culture came gradually. "Lyric Poetry was commonly described well through the Renaissance as a variety of rhetoric (the art of oratory). Through antiquity, the Middle Ages, and much later, most written matter remained associated with the oral to a degree seldom appreciated today. In antiquity reading was normally aloud even when it was to oneself. In his Confessions (VI3) Augustine makes special note of the fact that when he dropped in on Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, he found Ambrose reading to himself without making any sound. Augustine's note shows that silent private reading was not entirely unknown, but it also shows that it was certainly singular and deserving of comment (Ong, Presence of the Word, p. 58).

A later more cautionary view of the school and a negative view of the character of the hedge schoolmasters are presented in Traits and Stories of the Irish Peasantry, Carleton's description of the Hedge School is thus:

> The student usually remained at the next school in the vicinity until he supposed that he had completely drained the master of all his knowledge. This circumstance was generally discovered in the following manner: - As soon as he judged himself a match for his teacher, and possessed sufficient confidence in his own powers, he penned him a formal challenge to meet him in literary contest, either in his own school, before competent witnesses, or at the chapel-green, on the Sabbath day, before the arrival of the priest, or probably after it - for the priest himself was generally the moderator and judge upon these occasions. This challenge was generally couched in rhyme, and either sent by the hands of a common friend, or posted upon the chapel door. These contests, as the reader perceives, were always public, and were witnessed by the peasantry with intense interest. If the master sustained a defeat, it was not so much attributed to his want of learning, as to the overwhelming talent of his opponent; nor was the success of the pupil generally followed by the expulsion of the master - for this was but the first of a series of challenges which the former proposed to undertake, ere he eventually settled himself in the exercise of his profession. (Carleton, p. 146-147).

In spite of the condescending analysis to the conquered Irish peasant, Carleton concludes that the Hedge School produced scholars the equal of those from the finest English academies. The oral tradition emphasizes a unified culture. "The network of personal loyalties which oral cultures favor as matrices of communication and as principles of social unity" were very much active in peasant Nineteenth century Ireland and this matrix, focusing on Hedge scholarship, kept the culture vital in the face of English domination (Ong, p. 54). Carleton's description of the capture and kidnapping of a superior teacher Mat Kavanagh by the Findramore boys from the Ballyschanlan boys is a hilarious account of the Irish drive to possess the best education available (Carleton, p. 155-240). 'Best' also meant oral and anything that enhanced oral teaching was heartily approved of, especially booye or poteen. "Mat . . . teaches the boys better whin he's drunk nor whin he's sober; and you'll never find a good tacher, sir, but's fond of it. As for Mat when he's half gone, I'd turn him again the country for deipness in larning; for its then he rhymes it out of him, that it would do one good to hear him" (Carleton, p. 143-144).

The perceptions of a totally debauched Celtic Hedge education system came, not surprisingly, from the English:

> 'At the English Conquest,' wrote Thomas Croker in the early nineteenth century, 'Ireland was unquestionably in a state of profound ignorance; . . . and to the present day,' says Sir Richard Cox 'very few of the Irish aim at any more than a little Latin, which every cow-boy pretends to, and a smattering of logic, which very few of them know the use of.'
>
> States a minister from County Clare, 'The hedge schools are as miserable, and the books read in them as worthless as they have been observed to be in other parts of Ireland.' The situation was the same in County Wexford. 'Nothing can be more deplorable,' claimed the Reverend Edward Barton; 'the people have no place to resort to, but a few miserable hedge schools where the teachers are almost in as great need of instruction as themselves.' The greatest need throughout Ireland, insisted the Reverend John Graham of County Londonderry, 'is school-houses and teachers.... The school-houses are in general wretched huts, built of sods in the highway ditches, from which circumstances they are denominated hedge-schools. They have neither door, window, nor chimney; a large hole in the roof serving to admit light, and let out the smoke, which issues from a fire in the middle of the house. A low narrow hole cut in the mud wall on the south side of the hut affords ingress and egress to its inhabitants. These schools are fully attended in summer - half empty in spring and harvest, and from the cold and damp, utterly deserted in winter; so that the children, who periodically resort to them for instruction, usually forget in one part of the year, what they have learned in the other.' Mr. Graham believed that the instruction at these hedge-schools was dangerous and subversive. When the students 'have learned to read,' he charged, 'their attention is directed to the biographies of robbers, thieves, and prostitutes, the reveries of knights errant and crusaders, a seditious history of Ireland, tales of apparitions, witches and fairies, and a new system of boxing." (Croker, cited in McWhiney, p. 212-213).

The physical description of the Hedge school is agreed upon but not the quality of the teacher, curricula, or the taught. One suspects the schools varied greatly.

English education in Ireland and the Celtic zones of Britain and its counterpart in the Appalachian highlands was feared as a destroyer of culture. McWhiney says:

> Men who were reluctant to become part of an industrial society understandably rejected the arts and sciences needed to maintain such a society. Neither southern Crackers nor their Celtic ancestors abjured education, but what they favored were skills that would sustain, not help to destroy, their culture. Somehow they seemed to understand, just as American Indians often understood, that Yankee or English education was as dangerous to them and to their culture as Yankee or English bullets.
>
> What outsiders taught, under the guise of enlightenment and knowledge, was merely subservience to alien ways and values. Many Southerners saw formal education as an insidious way to acculturate and enslave them. Learning to read and to write would, rather than free them, put them even more at the Yankees' mercy by making them mere cogs in the northern machine. They could remain free only by perfecting the skills that reinforced their own traditions. In argument against the establishment of a public school system in North Carolina, one man stated that it was unnecessary as well as undesirable 'that **everybody** should be able to read and cipher. (McWhiney, Grady, p. 214-215).

McWhiney further argues that historians have based their conclusions on the written records of a literate and 'Yankeefied' Southern minority quite disconnected from the cultural majority of the South (McWhiney, p. 215). Butts and Cremin, however, point out that North Carolina in 1861 had four thousand public elementary schools serving one hundred and sixty thousand students but that little existed prior to 1850 (Butts and Cremin, p. 251) and North Carolina was the most educationally advanced Southern State. Descriptions of the state of education, quality of teachers of the southern and Appalachian schools parallel the range of horrors to excellence of the Celtic hedge schools and "the Federal census of 1850 reported that more than 20% of the South's natives could neither read nor write, compared with only 0.42% of New Englands" (McWhiney, p. 196).

The only point the various authors seem to agree upon was that a culture clash was visible and its broad parameters were the ancient Celtic-Saxon views. By Celtic, I mean a cultural attitude dominating a cultural zone. The Highlander is predominantly Scotch Irish but the Highlander is everything else as well, ethnically, politically, religiously, only united in the fact that they are in the Highlands because they lost at something, were escaping something, or didn't fit into something. That something runs the gamut from kidnapped young boys and girls, stolen in British sea ports, to religious dissenters, to convicted, deported criminals, to indentured servants from the North and Tidewater who went looking for affordable land after their indenture, to yeomen supporters of Tidewater loyalists during the Revolution, on and on. They ended in the Appalachian Highlands and came to see education, particularly based on class or preparation for trade as in the English system; or trade and economic mobility and citizenship as in the American tradition, as antithetical to the maintenance of the culture forged by these dispirit groups in the Highlands. Appalachian and more generally southern youth sent north to northern colleges were considered to return tainted, 'yankeefied' and proselytized out of their cultures (McWhiney, p. 200). Actually, by 1850 there were proportionately more southern young in colleges and universities than in the north but the quality was considered abysmal. In 1860 "one out of every 247 whites in the south was attending college, compared with only one out of 703 in the north" (McWhiney, p. 198). The crucial period for our considerations seems to be between 1830 and 1860. "The nature of work in America was changing, in 1820 most Rochesterians (and Americans) worked,

played, and slept in the same place, there were no neighborhoods. There were no neighborhoods as we understand them: no distinct commercial and residential zones, no residential areas based upon social class ---. That changed quickly after 1825" (Johnson, Paul E., The Shopkeepers Millennium: Societies and Revival in Rochester, New York, 1815-1837, p. 48). Commercial America, outside of the South, and particularly the mountains, changed and the economic disjuncture between sections that emerged was one of the causes of the Civil War. The period 1861 to 1865 effectively devastated southern education while the north's remained unaffected. The misery of reconstruction added to the inequity and it wasn't until 1953 that the south again regained the economic parity with the north that it had enjoyed in 1861. Religiously, what one can't avoid, one can raise to the level of a virtue, so formal education became the avenue for losing your faith, prosperity became the vehicle for eternal perdition, and worse, education made you economically mobile thus violating the tight kinship and religiosity patterns of the Appalachian Highlands. Education in fact became the enemy of kinship and religion. It led to personal mobility. This attitude is not at all uncommon even now in the mountain counties of East Tennessee.

What is intriguing in the present, however, is the enthusiasm of a growing number of Appalachian white families, particularly fairly prosperous families, who are attending church schools and academies that are growing rapidly in the region. Many of these started out as Christian segregationist academies, including the most prestigious private school in Knoxville, Webb School, but things have changed. I am increasingly convinced that the affection for these schools is now based on values, a dedication to the family, and an avoidance of modernity as defined by mobile corporate America. The private schools in all their variety in the South maybe be cycling through the cultural patterns of the Hedge School in all its variety, in the Celtic zones when confronted with an unappealing conquering English culture. This may be affecting the academy as well, as academics begin to perceive the diversity of the religious right extending from the repugnant utterances of a Pat Robinson or a Jerry Falwell to a benign quest for some connection of spiritual and secular in an increasingly mechanistic world. Things are changing too fast and too frequently to get a clear sense of the future of the phenomenon but Paul Tillich supplies us with a template for looking at the broad assumptions of the movement in his chapter on A Theology of Education found in his book, A Theology of Culture. Here he laments the sole domination of the 'technical aim of education' demanding the adjustment of the individual to an industrial society made up of competing national states (Tillich, p. 149). He argues that the church schools attempt, again in all their varieties, to reinstitute 'inducting education' where one is inducted to some place, to some structure, to some idea; a person is centered. Humanistic education first took over from inducting education in the Renaissance wherein the individual came to the fore as a type of 'self contained mini universe.' The technical model subsumed both the humanistic and the inducted models by the mid twentieth century. The inductive and the humanistic are reemerging in the "Hedge Schools" of the world. For the purpose of this paper, the template offers the caution of the tremendous power of any inductive humanistic and technical combination school because like the Hedge schools of Ireland the parents, the teachers and the students operate from a single agreed upon set of assumptions: they know exactly what they are against, all three participants agree on what they are for, and how best to accomplish it, and they have all made a financial sacrifice to guarantee its achievement with expensive tuition for parents, low pay for teachers, and spartan facilities for the students. Tillich argues this produces tremendous dedication and a will to succeed because 'you know you are right.' (Tillich, p. 50). The technical model offers primarily induction into the world of work, an induction that can no longer be guaranteed in the faltering economies of the present. Should these movements continue as they have in the past two decades, the thesis of Moynihan and Kotkin and Tillich may produce a twenty-first century very, very different from the assumptions of ever more sophisticated technical progress that now drives curricular planning in our public schools and in our State universities. At the very least we in the academy might be advised to look farther afield than our own institutions and writings for the data upon which our predictions are based, for the outline of the twenty-first century. If this information becomes too disturbing, we can always rely on the sheer power of the technical society to eventually dominate, at whatever cost to other options attempting to emerge. The British did win, the Celts did become, and are still, marginalized, and the Hedge Schools are gone - - - maybe.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bourke, Ulrich. The Memoirs of the Right Honorable the Marquis of Clanricarde. [London]: n.p., 1722.

Butts, Freeman R. & Cremin, Laurence A. The History of Education in American Culture. Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, New York, 1965.

Campion, Edmund. The Bokes of the Histories of Ireland. Ed. A. F. Vossen. Assen, Netherlands: Van Gorcum & Co., N. V., 1963.

Carleton, W. Traits and Stories of the Irish Peasantry. London: Baldwin and Cradock, 1836.

Caudill, Harry. The Watches of the Night. Little, Brown & Company, Boston-Toronto, 1976.

----------. Night Comes to the Cumberland. Little, Brown & Company, Boston-Toronto, 1963.

Dowling, John P. The Hedge Schools of Ireland. The Talbot Press Limited, Dublin & Cork, 1932.

Gwynn, Edward. "The Metrical Dindshenchas." Royal Irish Academy, Todd Lecture Series, X, Pt. 3 (1913), 110-119.

Harley MS Index, Codicile 432.

Kephart, Horace. Our Southern Highlanders. University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville, 1976.

Kotkin, Joel. Tribes: How Race, Religion and Identity Determine Success in the New Global Economy.

McGrath, Fergal. Education in Ancient and Medieval Ireland. Dublin: Studies 'Special Publications' 1979.

McWhiney, Grady. Cracker Culture: Celtic Ways in the Old South. University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa & London, 1988.

Moynehan, Daniel P. Pandaemonium: Ethnicity in International Politics. Oxford University Press, 1993.

Ong, Walter. The Presence of the Word. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1967.

Stokes, Whitley. "The Prose Tales in the Rennes Dindsenchas." Revue Celtique, 15 (1894), 273-336.

Tillich, Paul. The Theology of Culture. Oxford University Press, London, 1975.

Weller, Jack. Yesterday's People. University of Kentucky Press, Lexington, 1966.

INFLUENCES THAT SHAPED SUSAN BLOW'S INVOLVEMENT IN KINDERGARTEN EDUCATION

Paul D. Travers
University of Missouri-St. Louis

Educational historians are well aware of the establishment of the kindergarten movement in the United States. My interest in this movement, however, has developed primarily because of the availability of preserved material by both William Torrey Harris and Susan Elizabeth Blow on the founding of the first permanent kindergarten in a public school system. Even though I had attempted earlier to determine Harris' role in establishing a kindergarten based upon Froebel's philosophy, I was still left with questions about who influenced whom? Why did St. Louis cease to be a national mecca for kindergartners ten years after it gained recognition? And what success did Blow attain in regard to early childhood education after Harris resigned the superintendency in 1880? Throughout this paper I use the term "kindergartner," which referred at that time to a teacher at this level, not a child who attended.

I would like to build a brief context for the effort both Harris and Blow undertook to establish such a program in St. Louis. Blow's family was wealthy and played a prominent part in St. Louis history from 1830 on. Her father, Henry Taylor Blow, had attended the fledgling St. Louis University to study law but quickly abandoned that to pursue business interests in mining and the commercial use of paint and linseed oil. Politically, he opposed slavery, served in the Missouri Senate from 1854 to 1859, and was appointed by Lincoln to serve as ambassador to Venezuela in 1861. He served also as the Republican representative from Missouri in Congress from 1863 until 1867 and two years later was appointed by President Grant as ambassador to Brazil, a position he held for two years. He finished his career as one of three commissioners for the District of Columbia until his death in 1875.

Henry's involvement in civic matters also involved him in the legal attempt to free Dred Scott, who was originally owned by his father. Henry signed bond for Scott in 1846 ensuring his temporary freedom; however, after three appeals, the U.S. Supreme Court in 1857 declared Scott a slave. Eventually Henry's brother obtained ownership of Scott and freed him.[1]

My purpose in enumerating these facts is that I believe Blow's prominence had something to do with the establishment of the kindergarten. Henry was truly one of the leading citizens in St. Louis. Without his credentials, his daughter Susan would not have had meetings with Superintendent Harris about the initiation of the kindergarten. She was not educationally a significant person at this time. Harris had been a teacher and administrator in the City Schools since 1857, so he was aware of the importance of Blow's family in St. Louis. To corroborate this fact, Henry's business successor of a company Blow had owned served on the City's school board and in 1871 participated on a committee to study the value of a possible kindergarten in St. Louis. With such connections, it was easy, in my opinion, for Susan to meet Harris and to encourage him to move forward on this innovation.[2]

Harris, on the other hand, was a relative newcomer to St. Louis. When he met Susan, he had lived in the City for only fifteen years, but he rose through the school system rapidly. Without completing Yale College, he came to St. Louis as a teacher in 1857 and by 1867 was appointed superintendent of schools. He was during this ten year period involved heavily with German philosophy in regard to the founding of a Hegelian discussion group, which met regularly and published it ideas in the JOURNAL OF SPECULATIVE PHILOSOPHY. Harris had collaborated with Henry Brokmeyer, who spent most of his life translating Hegel's LOGIC. Brokmeyer became somewhat prominent in state politics, but his lasting contribution lay more in stimulating Harris to study philosophy. In a sense, he was Harris' mentor in the diffusion of German philosophy in St. Louis. Harris also was becoming in the late 1860s a devotee of Froebel, although he thought real education began after seven years of age.[3]

As stated, Harris was superintendent of schools in 1867. The first piece of evidence I can encounter concerning his interest in experimenting with kindergarten methods in the schools was the result of a letter to him from Elizabeth Peabody on May 18, 1870. She stated that she had recently learned of his superintendency and was hopeful that Froebel's kindergarten would become a "part of your public school system."[4] She had hoped the same thing would happen in Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York, and New Bedford. Her entire letter was intended to convince Harris of Froebel's value concerning the education of children below seven years of age. She also asked Harris to confer further with her on the matter either in Chicago or Watertown, Wisconsin, sites of upcoming teachers' conventions she would be attending. Harris, however, attended neither, which prompted Peabody to write again on August 25, 1870 that she was disappointed not to see him. She also was chagrined that he obviously did not read the material on primary education that she had sent to him. She based this assumption on his comment that "St. Louis is too hot for the kindergarten culture of children." She replied emotionally that "if St. Louis is not too hot for children to be born there, it cannot be too hot for the mind as well as body to grow on nature's plan of development which is just Froebel's kindergarten plan."[5]

She continued to send Harris materials about the Kindergarten Association established several years earlier in Boston and which claimed such members as Mary Mann and Henry Barnard. In part, the Association promulgated the cause of making kindergartens public and extending them to children seven years of age.[6] Barnard, incidentally, also by 1870 had given much attention in his AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EDUCATION to Froebel's kindergarten and its adoption by devotees in Wisconsin and Massachusetts. Consequently,

Harris was well-aware of the private interest in children at this level and was contemplating some experimentation in kindergarten methods, but in 1870 he was still not convinced that the program should be part of the public schools. Evidence of this exists in another letter from Peabody to Harris on August 26, 1871 when she politely chided him for using the excuse that there was inadequate space for formal kindergartens. Peabody believed that if this was the case, then he should at least induce parents to establish private kindergartens. She supplemented this point by emotionally stressing the value of Froebel's philosophy for children.[7]

Evidently, Harris, and later Blow, felt that Peabody was too assertive in the cause of creating and linking the kindergarten to the public school. They did not disagree with the substance of what she and other members of the Kindergarten Association advocated; however, I do not believe they liked her style or approach. For example, Blow, in a letter to Harris on November 10, 1873, insinuated that both she and Harris thought Peabody was too forward in her inquiry about the kindergarten movement in St. Louis, so Blow recommended to Harris that they answer none of her questions save the number of pupils enrolled, hours spent in activities, and number of kindergartners employed. It seems that Peabody was trying to ascertain whether the St. Louis effort was genuinely following Froebel's views.[8]

As stated earlier, under Harris' tenure as St. Louis superintendent, the board of education created a committee of three prominent citizens, one of whom was Thomas Richeson, a former business compatriot of Susan Blow's father, to travel to Newark, New Jersey to see the much publicized kindergarten under the supervision of Dr. Adolph Douai, a German disciple of Froebel. The committee returned with a glowing report that such a play school would help "to train a child in perseverance, develop his personality, encourage expression of his talents, and give him ample exercise and healthful surroundings."[9] Harris liked the idea that good habits and mental discipline acquired in such a play school would pay dividends later in higher grades. The board concurred, and largely as a result of this one report and Harris' support, authorized Harris to try a play school in 1872. Actually, Harris had experimented with features of the kindergarten before the committee's recommendations; however, the board had not responded enthusiastically until the above recommendations. In addition, Peabody had been putting pressure on Harris in 1870, but it took approximately two years for Harris to implement a program. He was genuinely concerned about the fact that most youth left school at age ten; consequently, a kindergarten for three to seven year old children working with Froebel's "gifts" and "occupations" would assist the child in gaining eventual individuality.

At this time, 1872, Susan Blow saw a golden opportunity. She had just completed a vacation in Europe with her family subsequent to her father's resignation as ambassador to Brazil. While in Germany she became infatuated with the kindergarten. Upon returning to St. Louis and learning of the experiment, which I believe by means of her father, she contacted Harris to offer her services gratuitously. She had no normal school training, nor did she desire to become an employee of the school system. In fact, throughout her fourteen-year association with the system, she technically was never an employee. Harris was impressed by her, but recommended first that she study several months in a New York institute under a well-known Froebelian disciple, Maria Kraus-Boelte, before returning to St. Louis to direct the program at the new Des Peres School.[10]

From this point on, Susan Blow was indefatigable in her kindergarten crusade. According to her autobiography, she was not formally well-educated considering her father's wealth. She had only the equivalence of a secondary education, primarily by means of inferior tutors and short stays in private elementary schools. She had spent some time in New York as a student in a girls' social finishing school, but except for occasional guest presentations which were inspiring, she found the time unchallenging. What developed her talents most were her voracious reading habits in philosophy and her travel with her father while he served as ambassador, particularly to Brazil.[11] In corresponding with Harris, while again in New York studying Froebel's methods, she had hoped to return to St. Louis in the fall of 1873; however, Harris prevailed upon her to return in the spring of 1873 and start what would become the first permanent public school kindergarten in the United States.[12] Unfortunately, the Des Peres School was still under construction, so in the spring she began with twelve children in her home and, in the fall of 1873 when Des Peres opened, she was appointed Director over one teacher and two student assistants. Twenty children showed up, with over forty enrolled by the close of registration. In 1873, one room at Des Peres was devoted to morning kindergarten instruction. In 1874 an afternoon class was added and by 1879, 57 kindergartens were in existence. Several years later the remaining 25 city elementary schools had half-day kindergartens as an integral part of St. Louis education.

For the next eleven years, Blow worked tirelessly to correlate theory and practice for kindergartners. Assistants wanting to become kindergartners were assigned as aides for one-half day and were lectured to the other half and on Saturdays. She utilized Greek tragedies, Shakespeare, Dante, and additional classics in her presentations because she wanted those who were planning to become teachers to possess a general culture in addition to having a mastery of Froebel's mission in regard to the use of his "occupations," "gifts," and "story-telling" procedures. In other words, cultural transmission was important to her.

When Harris resigned his superintendency in St. Louis in 1880, Susan stayed on for four more years, but her influence waned. She was afraid with a new superintendent, Edward Long, and a board that was not unanimous about the importance of the kindergarten that this level would become subservient to the mentality of gradedness, rather than the freedom of the kindergarten shaping the flexibility of the subsequent grades. Her fears were realized in that a new supervisor was appointed in 1884, Mary McCullough, who brought the kindergartens under the control of elementary supervisors. Harris and Blow previously had preserved a degree of autonomy for the kindergarten, but that was now over. In addition, Blow contracted Graves' disease, which affected her thyroid and immune system. She suffered from extreme fatigue and insomnia; however, about eight years later she underwent an operation and recovered remarkably well.

Five of her staff in St. Louis resigned with her within a two-year period and at first glance one could believe

that the kindergarten movement was hurt. However, greater national diffusion resulted. Her assistants who left also became prominent in other key locations: Laura Fisher in Boston, Cynthia Dozier in New York, Mary Runyan at Teachers' College, Caroline Hart in Baltimore, and Harriet Head in Washington, D.C. Blow also became a gifted lecturer and author. She wrote six books, of which SYMBOLIC EDUCATION became very well known. Froebel's views are dominant throughout this volume. She addressed groups in dramatic fashion, particularly members of the International Kindergarten Union. She was always a speaker in demand who could combine ideas from the fields of philosophy and literature with the strategies of teaching young children. She believed strongly that the more literal the interpretation of Froebel's ideas in kindergarten instruction the better. This message was often made to meetings held by the International Kindergarten Union, which was founded in 1892. Blow was on its advisory board from 1896 until her death in 1916.

Blow began lecturing at Teachers' College in 1896 and with Mary Runyan, a former assistant in St. Louis who was now on the faculty at Teachers' College, forged a new alliance in support of a Froebelian view of kindergarten education. However, times were changing. Progressivism in terms of the use of psychology, or behaviorism in general, was on the increase at the expense of the "old" philosophy of Froebel. Patty Smith Hill now was becoming the new power in kindergarten education and she was also on the faculty of Teachers' College. In a sense, it was an exciting time for students of early childhood education, but, on the other hand, it marked the sad decline of a proud, articulate purist, who would not compromise her principles of kindergarten education. She died in 1916 realizing that her influence had waned considerably.[13]

In summary, Susan Blow was a remarkable pioneer. Her association with Harris by means of over 200 letters offer a veritable goldmine of educational history. Her generosity was magnanimous. She never did anything for monetary profit. Her goal was always to enrich especially the lives of children between the ages of three to seven. My belief is that the public school kindergarten is more her legacy than it is that of William Torrey Harris. Without him she would not have had a chance, but her life was the kindergarten.

REFERENCES

[1] Margaret Hilliker, "The Blow Family." An Address to the Carondelet Women's Club, February 7, 1955. Missouri Historical Society, pp. 1-8.

[2] Ibid.

[3] William Schuyler, "The St. Louis Philosophical Movement," EDUCATIONAL REVIEW, 29 (May 1905), 450-67.

[4] Letter from Elizabeth Peabody to William T. Harris, May 18, 1870, Missouri Historical Society.

[5] Letter from Elizabeth Peabody to William T. Harris, August 25, 1870, Missouri Historical Society.

[6] Letter from Elizabeth Peabody to William T. Harris, November (n.d.), 1873, Missouri Historical Society.

[7] Letter from Elizabeth Peabody to William T. Harris, August 26, 1871, Missouri Historical Society.

[8] Letter from Susan Blow to William T. Harris, November 10, 1873, Missouri Historical Society.

[9] Hilliker, op. cit., p. 13.

[10] Agnes Snyder, DAUNTLESS WOMEN IN CHILDHOOD EDUCATION, 1856-1931 (Washington, D.C., Association for Childhood Education International, 1972), p. 61.

[11] Letter from Susan Blow to William T. Harris, July 9, 1892, Missouri Historical Society.

[12] Letter from Susan Blow to William T. Harris, November 14, 1872, Missouri Historical Society.

[13] Snyder, op. cit., pp. 59-85.

KENNETH D. BENNE IN RETROSPECT

William H. Fisher
University of Montana

Choosing a subject (and then giving the subject a title) for these annual SWPES meetings isn't always an easy task. However, at least for me, this year it was quite simple. The reason is that when Ken Benne left this world on October the 8th, 1992, and I read about it, there intuitively jumped at me the response--"There's my topic for the next SWPES meetings." Not that the prospect was a happy one (quite the contrary) but I knew instantly the topic could be packed with substance.[1]

The NTL (National Training Laboratories), an institute for applied behavioral science, was founded by Leland Bradfor, Ron Lippitt, and Ken Benne in 1947 and since then has had a remarkable growth.[2] Its first impact came under the rubric of T-Group (or training group), and various terminology has been applied to the evolution of the group process, said developments taking a variety of forms but all of them resting on the assumption that group methods of learning have been too long ignored. Indeed, this presentation (as I am roughing it out) seems ephemeral and difficult to pin down, but my guess is that all of my listeners and/or readers have somehow been influenced by a few colleagues who believed in and have tried tO practice group process in one or another of its aspects.[3]

Benne was so talented in a variety of fields and endeavors, one is inclined to say he was some kind of Renaissance man. Such being the case, we cannot dwell indefinitely on his contributions, in theory and practice, to what has been referred to as Human Relations.[4] We may add, however, that so long as students have reason to protest against reliance on the lecture system of teaching as boring and without significance (whether they realize it or not) these same students will somehow be in Ken Benne's debt.[5]

Although Ken Benne was beyond a doubt a great intellectual, the last thing in the world he wanted to do was to pose as such--get on some kind of an ego trip. He was down-to-earth and informal in his dealings with people and his own friendly nature seemed to come to him naturally.[6] A case in point is a letter I received recently (this is being written in mid-April, 1993) from my friend, Ken Winetrout, formerly a professor at American International College in Springfield, Massachusetts. Since the two Kens had known each other when Benne taught at Boston University, I asked Winetrout for some kind of a run-down on Benne--one which I might use in this paper. The response I received was to this effect, "I liked Ken Benne. Saw him with some frequency when he was here in the Northeast. . . .The nice thing about him, it was always a pleasure to meet him, to talk with him. A truly nice man."[7]

This paper is anything but complete. At the very least. a book or books re Benne should be--indeed must be--in the works. However, since I assigned myself the subject to be somehow covered in a paper, I am determined to stay with it! So, let's touch upon topics which are really two sides of the same coin: the challenge of authority and social reconstruction.[8] Thus, for purposes of categorizing Ken even though we need to be just a bit cautious on this point, we must place him in the same philosophical camp with George Counts, Harold Rugg, William O. Stanley, Theodore Brameld, William Earle Drake, H. Gordon Hullfish, et al. (please note my underlining of et al., inasmuch as my listings are surely incomplete).

"John Dewey's ninetieth birthday, October 20, 1949, was an occasion for celebration throughout the democratic world."[9] The foregoing is the opening sentence in the "Editor's Preface," a statement in the book, Essays for John Dewey's Ninetieth Birthday, a publication of the Bureau of Research and Service, College of Education, University of Illinois, Urbana (1950). And who were the editors of the booklet--the basic statements delivered at a conference at the University of Illinois? You may have guessed it: Kenneth D. Benne, President of the American Education Fellowship (successor of the Progressive Education Association) and William O. Stanley, Chair of the Division of Social, Philosophical and Historical Foundations, College of Education of the University of Illinois. A special introduction written to be read at the conference, and reprinted in the booklet, was by John Dewey, himself.

While it is well known that Dewey's instrumentalism had the imprint of his own particular brand of pragmatism, nonetheless it is generally agreed that Dewey genuinely was one of the three great philosophers in the founding of American pragmatism (the other two were William James and Charles Sanders Peirce). It is also generally known that Kenneth D. Benne surely did fall within the pragmatic philosophical framework, though he was sufficiently original and ingenious not to copy anyone. If the controversy which developed within the progressive education movement over the issue of social reconstruction versus staying within the frame of pragmatism without extending it into the realm of radical social change--if indeed the controversy was significant (I believe that it was), then we may probably assert that Benne found himself among the reconstructionists.[10] That Benne himself surely would not object to his being categorized as among the reconstructionists is illustrated by a comment in Paul Nash's previously-mentioned biographical sketch: "His recent thinking is beautifully summarized in an essay written in collaboration with William O. Stanley III, entitled 'Social Reconstruction for Twenty-First Century Educators.'"

Before leaving the pragmatic element in Ken Benne's philosophy, possibly two more aspects of his ruminations are worthy of mention: (1) His orientation toward community and its overall manifestation as part and parcel of pragmatism; and (2) the role that philosophers should play in articulating what ordinary people think. In other words, philosophers don't necessarily tell people what to think, but the former can and should learn from the latter. Ken dwelt on these points during his own remarks at the Illinois birthday conference: (1) We may cite one of the many meanings ascribed to community as gleaned from dictionary definitions (i.e., friendly association, fellowship); and (2) from Benne's University of

Illinois remarks: "Perhaps we can learn from Dewey in 1949, how, in our thinking about society and education, to keep close to the emerging aspirations and modes of thinking of the common people. . ."[11]

Community as part-and-parcel of the philosophy of pragmatism, has been variously defined.[12] We don't have the time to elaborate on its various pragmatic meanings in this short paper. Suffice it to mention that bringing people closer together in a sense of oneness is surely an interpretation that would meet the approval of Kenneth D. Benne. He roundly praised and encouraged the development of broadly-based manifestations of friendship among various kinds of people. And he practiced what he preached. The intellectual arrogance which is frequently to be found among certain college and university faculty, was just plain foreign to his nature.[13]

A further elaboration of my comments above re the need for philosophers to attempt to articulate what ordinary people are thinking is reflected in Benne's works, which are not, in my opinion, difficult to read. However, I am writing here about all those teachers of philosophy who somehow come under the rubric of pragmatism. These have a special obligation to listen and study what so-called "common people" are thinking and saying. In short, we should behave in such a manner as to interpret what might be referred to as a "typically American" philosophy.[14]

A thoughtful person attempts to analyze the thinking of one of his/her fellows, and does this within a frame of whether she/he is working for the good of humankind or whether the individual operates within a strictly selfish framework. Then, in answering this question, the ruminations (at least in my view) will follow a line of reasoning based upon a further question: Does the individual challenge authority? In the context of writing about Ken Benne, we have already postulated that many of the works which he wrote did, indeed, represent some kind of a challenge to authority. Yet, at the same time, we have emphasized that he was a kindly person, given to informality in interpersonal relations.

Under the circumstances, so far as it is possible, we would then have to explicate that Benne's challenge to authority rested largely upon objective, balanced ways of thinking.[15] In short, he was basically critical of social institutions rather than individuals.[16] His thinking was trenchant, and it may be added that across the years those who have paved the way for a more broadly-based democracy in the Western World are those who have not backed off from demonstrating the kind of vision and courage which have brought our various freedoms to the point which they have currently reached.[17]

As the saying goes, there are gray areas which result from an overlapping of Benne's interest in a number of different issues. In expressing his ideas and opinions regarding these topics, he frequently selected an individual and his/her recognized reputation as symbolic of pioneering research in the field. For example, he was a great exponent of many of the ideas of Kurt Lewin.[18] Indeed, all the recognized leaders in group-process were indebted to Lewin--and most of them recognized the fact. In his "The Processes of RE-Education: An Assessment of Kurt Lewin's Views," Benne not only reflected his debt to Lewin in the context of the study of groups and how they behave, but he paid special attention to Lewin's experimental work and his efforts to bring about changed attitudes and behavior.[19] Overall, it is evident that social reconstruction and its various spinoffs could never, but never, occur as long as people find it impossible to change their attitudes.[20]

The relationship between ends and means has been a topic which has long concerned those philosophers who come under the rubric of pragmatism. And surely, no one has dealt more pointedly with this topic than has Dewey.[21] Inevitably, Benne and his co-workers and co-authors would somehow give their attention to problems related to ends/means.[22] The late E.E. Bayles also much involved himself in discussions related to this aspect of human behavior.[23]

While there isn't the time nor space to go into an in-depth consideration of ends/means, we mention it simply because a paper related to pragmatic philosophy simply must face up to this subject. It is quite easy to assert that, in a democracy, ends and means must be consistent. Another way of looking at it is, ends/means cannot be separated. And still another has spelled out Kant's well-known categorical-imperative: "So act as to treat humanity, whether in thine own person or in that of any other, in every case as an end, never as a means only."

The foregoing paragraphs are related to process--and it may be reasonably assumed that process is an important part of the lexicon of pragmatism. Likewise, it is virtually a redundancy to assert that pragmatic philosophy impacted upon the progressive education movement.[24] And much has been made by those who have leaned strongly, in both theory and practice, in the direction of progressivism--in short, they have asserted it as a truism that most instructors teach the way in which they have been taught. Thus experience is another of those terms closely related to the kind of philosophy upon which the progressive education movement was built. This is another way of stating that learning is not only a product, it is also a process; Ken Benne's concerns were closely identified with process and ends/means.

Paul Nash is well known to those across the United States who teach Philosophy of Education. Born in England, his educational career was founded in undergraduate and graduate studies in the British Isles, Canada, and Harvard.[25] While he is alive and in good health, it would indeed be productive if someone delved into important events in Nash's life as he has been one of the most articulate defenders of progressive education and all it has stood for.[26] It was fortuitous that Nash landed at Boston University when Ken Benne had already been there for a few years teaching in the department of Educational Foundations, and also Ken was the head of the BU Human Relations Center.[27]

Nash sent the author (whf) a typescript titled "Kenneth D. Benne" which was written shortly after the latter's passing. Significant quotes from Nash's piece are worth mentioning:

> . . .I became drawn into the work of the Human Relations Center [an] I participated in my first T-group. The experience was so powerful that I sought further experience and competence in the field. . . I was invited by Ken to serve as a senior staff member in a summer human relations laboratory. . .and to co-lead a T-group with him. I didn't feel ready to do this. . .[28]

To make a long story short, Benne quite typically gave Nash some reassurance which built his self-confidence, and Nash has stated the result: "It was a great experience and I performed as he had expected."[28] Two points are worth mentioning at this juncture: (1) although never a "Pollyanna" about it, Benne was always looking for the best in people; and (2) the very vehicle which Benne helped develop and in which he was a pioneer, the T-group and its various manifestations, was designed to play a clinical role in guidance and counseling. In short, Benne contributed to those studies which have been concerned with the importance of individual, personal adjustment in our society.

Previous reference has been made to Harold Rugg in connection with his having been in the philosophical camp of the social reconstructionist, and a further reference to Rugg is essential, especially his last important book, Imagination.[29] The late Theodore Brameld characterized this final Rugg opus as, ". . .a work that speaks urgently to all of us concerned to expand rather than contract the full powers of man."[30] And where is Professor Benne in this setting? Again, he is a pioneer in the sense that when Rugg died suddenly (May 1960), it was Kenneth Benne who Rugg's widow asked to finish the unfinished manuscript upon which her husband had been at work at the time of his death. And, said Benne,

> I did not hesitate long before accepting. . .my decision was based on a conviction that his work is crucially important. . . . The perpetuity, even the survival, of our civilization depends, in some large measure, upon finding a valid solution to the problem which he was struggling to clarify and to solve. What is the nature of man's power to create new and valid conceptions, forms and patterns of thought and relationship?[31]

No question about it, as previously indicated, Ken Benne was in the camp of those who (without apology) considered themselves social reconstructionist. This was apparent when one conversed with him re his professional situation at TC, Columbia during the 1940s. Although across the years there may be little doubt that he had great respect for TC, this surely does not mean that the respect was consistent. William F. Russell was the dean of TC in the forties at a time when Ken had limited respect for his leadership.[32] Also during the forties, Ken had a number of friends and colleagues at the University of Illinois and he had mixed feelings about staying at Teachers College. This bouncing back and forth between the two institutions came to an end in 1948 when he became a professor at Illinois and stayed there until 1953 when he moved to Boston University, retiring from there with Emeritus status in 1973.[33]

Besides his own inquisitive tendencies,[34] it is difficult to determine just who were the important figures who influenced his thinking and conclusions.[35] Karl Mannheim surely was among those seminal thinkers who impacted him. Charles Frankel in his The Case for Modern Man devoted a chapter to Mannheim.[36] Frankel is largely praiseworthy of Mannheim's refusal to support the belief that the social sciences, history included, can be (or should be) written in a thoroughly objective manner similar to the logical methods used in mathematics and the natural sciences.[37] And Ken Benne, I am sure, would have supported Frankel's analysis on this phase of Mannheim's work. Ken would have also sided with Mannheim in his assumption that there is a place for ideology--the latter in the sense that we cannot stay on top of the fence forever, and sooner or later we must take a stand on issues.

Assuming that Frankel's interpretation of Mannheim's philosophy is viable, Benne would have parted company with Mannheim in the latter's orientation that something like Plato's philosopher kings are fit to rule the rest of us.[38]

It is redundant to mention again that in a paper such as this we are only touching the surface, but I am hoping that my statement will motivate others to do more research and writing on Benne's life. With this in mind, I pass on to the subject of religion.

On May the 17th, 1993, I phoned Paul E. Blackwood in Washington, D.C. I first met Paul when we were students at TC in the later forties,and our acquaintance had been enhanced by our being from the State of Washington at that time, and we had mutual friends.[39] Also, I was aware that across the decades, Paul and Ken had an especially warm friendship. Paul and I had a long talk on the afternoon of the 17th, and a number of aspects of Ken Benne vis-a-vis religion were cleared up as a result of Blackwood's clarifying statements to me. And he said that there were strong indications that Ken Benne was some kind of humanist.[40]

Benne spent most of his formative years in Washington, Kansas, where he was active in the Methodist Church. Obviously, due to the influence of his parents, he attended Sunday School, sang in the church choir, etc.[41] One might add that this kind of rearing represented the "heart of America." literally and figuratively.

We will take a short detour from the subject of religion long enough to indicate that Ken's parents were influenced by agrarian radicalism and populism. As German immigrants they were characteristic of so many who came to this country either by choice or because they had to.[42] "Ken's own values were influenced by his father's tolerant, democratic, and unprejudiced attitudes and behavior."[43]

Now, back to religion: Blackwood informed me, at least in so many words, that while Benne lost the religion of his youth, he never gave up on religion in the true sense of the word.[44] When I asked him for further elaboration of the point, Blackwood asked me (in effect) if I knew something re humanism--and I answered in the affirmative. Again, in so many words, Blackwood said that was where Benne took his stance. I will say frankly and openly that I was very pleased to get these words from Ken Benne's best and closest friend. In short, Ken never really gave up on religion. Even though it is apparent that as a youth his attitudes toward this phase of his life weren't forced upon him by his parents, as he grew into maturity, whatever creedalism he had possessed departed from him in terms of his belief that the real test of a person's religion is to be found in what he/she practices, not in some creedal pronouncements.[45]

While accepting and agreeing with much that I have stated above, some readers and/or listeners may take exception to these contents on the grounds of: What about immortality? Can there be a religious base to one's thinking and acting if he/she doesn't believe in personal immortality? In the phone conversation previously referred to, I asked Paul Blackwood about this; he said that Ken benne in the traditional concept of immortality

could not accept that posture. In sum, he didn't support a belief in personal survival after death. But in a somewhat characteristic stance of certain liberal philosophers, Ken did believe in the kind of immortality postulated on an affirmation that if we have achieved or have helped to achieve goals that move our culture along in desirable and helpful ways, then a part of us keeps going in the lives of those whom we have influenced.[46]

We could go on and on, for there is virtually no end to the accolades which in viable terms could be said about the late Kenneth D. Benne.[47] But why prolong our discussion? In due course, and as stimulated by such groups as the National Training Laboratories, I feel sure there will be one or more biographies written re Ken. My purpose has been, in this relatively short statement, to (1) pay my fond respects to a friend, and (2) give us all some precepts the bases of which we may put into practice in our own lives by way of making us better persons, and the world a better place in which to live.

NOTES

[1] I had known Ken across the years: first at TC, Columbia, in the late forties when he was on the faculty and I was studying for the Ed.D. As a matter of fact, he was one of three members of my thesis committee and in this as well as in the number of other meetings, I came to know him quite well. And always I had tremendous respect for Ken!

[2] John J. DeWitt, of Wayne State University (Detroit), has stated that, ". . .his co-founding, his co-authoring, his co-editing, often conceals the strong possibility that Benne himself has been the major force behind much of these endeavors." The foregoing is a quote from a review of Benne's The Task of Post-Contemporary Education: Essays in Behalf of a Human Future (NY: Teachers College Press, 1990), p. 6 of a type-script review. The ms. was subsequently published in Educational Studies of the American Educational Studies Association, Spring, 1993, pp.43-52. Assuming that Professor DeWitt was on solid ground, which I assume, then this was typical of Ken Benne--always more than willing to give credit to others, when actually there is reason to believe he was the initiating force.

[3] While there seems to have been a hiatus in the use of small groups, etc., in the school setting this is probably only a temporary phenomenon. And surely in various gatherings all across the nation (definitely including meetings of business/commercial groups and others which may be typed as entrepreneurial) the small-group method of discussion and learning has more than come into its own. I may add that in a discussion with Ken one time, he told me that he feared (or words to that effect) that the very vehicle which he and others had developed for a setting primarily related to schools and schooling would, in due course, be preempted by others who lacked a truly educational orientation.

[4] See Ronald B. Levy's Human Relations: A Conceptual Approach (Scranton, Pa., International Textbook Col, 1969) for a fairly comprehensive coverage of group-process in its various manifestations. Other authors at approximately the same time--and this could have been a high-water point of this movement--were publishing on the same subject, but I admit to a preference for Levy's authorship since he was for many years a close friend. However, Levy's opus has a solid foundation both in research and literary style.

[5] While it would be manifestly unfair to categorize all those proponents of the lecture system as boring, nonetheless here is one writer who thinks that there is a bit of substance to the claim that "The lecture system is one whereby matter on the notes of the professor is transferred to the notes of the student without passing through the mind of either."

[6] A friendly nature is a product of heredity or environmental factors? This is a problem which has long concerned thoughtful students of human personality. My own stance is to the effect that environment and heredity intertwine when it comes to a study of the individual and his/her makeup.

[7] Quote from a letter to WHF from Professor Winetrout, dated 4/6/93. Also, see fn #2 above. John DeWitt makes it abundantly clear in his article also this was no accident. KB favored research studies designed to bring out the friendlier side of people and make social intercourse easier for all concerned. I make a point of this for the reason that during approximately forty years during which I have associated with college and university personnel, I have become firmly convinced that because a colleague is a great intellectual, by no means does that mean that he/she is a nice person.

[8] An NTL special bulletin announcing Benne's death was sent to the NTL membership shortly after his passing. This release included a short biographical sketch by Paul Nash, the well-known philosopher of education who had been a colleague of Ken's at Boston University. Nash mentioned the title of Benne's doctoral dissertation (at TC, Columbia), A Conception of Authority. He did so within the context of a further statement by Nash, "Democracy has been an enduring theme throughout his work and life." I will add that by precept and action Ken Benne opposed unmitigated authority throughout his professional career. But his approach was not only a negative one. The foregoing discussion has made it plain that he was essentially a gentle person and consistent with this approach, he did not tear down without building up. Social reconstruction was very much a part of his thinking and his professional actions.

[9] This preface makes it clear that Dewey was not only an educational philosopher, but one whose philosophizing impacted upon all the aspects of American life.

[10] A relatively short statement re this imbroglio may be found in Larry Cremin's well-known book, The Transformation of the School (Vintage Books edition, 1961). And within that context, it would be well to peruse pp. 231-233 in which he discusses the founding and development of the well known, but short-lived, journal, The Social Frontier.

[11] Webster's New World Dictionary, latest copyright by Simon and Schuster, 1980, p. 288. Point (1) as cited, fits altogether Benne's firm belief that educators should bring people closer and they should enhance the quality of friendship in this endeavor. And some years

ago John Dewey's face was replicated on a U.S. postage stamp--surely one symbol of his being more than a philosopher known only to educators. Amen! And here is one writer (whf) who will deny that Dewey's language was "fuzzy" and couldn't be understood. For those who have wanted to take the time to read carefully, Dewey is understandable; and further, he is among those thoughtful writers who have helped ordinary Americans articulate what they have been thinking.

[12]I remember attending a conference at the University of Colorado, Boulder, during 1959, on the occasion of the centenary of John Dewey's birth. Such luminaries as Melvin Rader, of the philosophy department at the University of Washington, and George Axtelle, the educational philosopher from Northwestern University were among the presenters. Much time was given to consideration of community as variously interpreted.

[13]Philosophers of education don't ordinarily need to be cautioned against arrogant attitudes in the classroom and on the campus, although some of them may have been instilled with this unfortunate quality. Since we are frequently looked down upon by the philosophy teachers of the strictly academic type, we know what it feels like to be placed in a lowly social category.

[14]Henry Steele Commager and others have labeled pragmatic philosophy as indigenous, indeed.

[15]While he surely, by example, wasn't afraid to take sides on basic issues, his writing reflect a reasoned approach rather than rhetoric loaded with subjectivity.

[16]Politically, he was clearly left-of-center, but as a pragmatist, he wasn't given to some party line. As a broadly-based thinker he also appreciated the importance of social institutions other than government.

[17]His Jeffersonian tendencies could hardly be more pointedly expressed than by Jefferson's own words: "I have sworn on the altar of God eternal hostility to every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

[18]See Warren Bennis, Kenneth D. Benne, Robert Chin, and Kenneth Correy, The Planning of Change, third edition (NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976), Chapter 8. Benne stated: ". . .experiences with re-education since Lewin's formation have confirmed his assumption that the 'whole person' must somehow be involved in processes of effective re-education." (p.318).

[19]Studies in social attitudes have largely come to the conclusion that the changing of said attitudes is one of the most difficult tasks in the whole realm of human behavior. This draft is written in May 1993, shortly after the Koresh tragedy in Waco, Texas. This illustrates dramatically one aspect of the development of attitudes.

[20]Although I cannot vouch for the precise time and circumstances in the context of which Winston Churchill made his pointed comment re what sort of a person a fanatic is, here is his statement: "A fanatic is one who cannot change his mind, and won't change the subject."

[21]Dewey is quoted: "I reached fairly early in the growth of my ideas a belief in the intimate and indissoluble connection of means used and ends reached." See Reginald D. Archambault, editor, John Dewey on Education (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964 and 1974), p. vii.

[22]His sensitivity (of the desirable kind) was reflected on innumerable occasions of both a professional and non-professional kind - - "sensitivity" indicating an awareness of important, current issues.

[23]Although fairly well known to many educators, Bayles's career was very possibly circumscribed in the sense of geography, most of his life having been lived in Kansas--the Wheat State--one not so well recognized beyond the Middle West. I attempted to compensate for this phenomenon in my article, "Ernie Bayles and Process" in Educational Studies (a journal in the Foundations of Education), vol. 12, #4, Winter 1981-82, pp. 417-424. The same reprinted in Academic Profiles in Higher Education, James J. Van Patten, editor (Lewiston/Queenstown/Lampeter: Edwin Mellen Press, 1992). pp. 173-185.

[24]See Lawrence A. Cremin, The Transformation of the School (NY: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961; Vintage Books Edition, 1964). While some critics of Cremin, notably Paul Nash, have stated that the former failed to present sufficiently the influence of pragmatism upon progressive education, nonetheless, Cremin did include reference to William James's foundational writings in Cremin's explication of those forces which brought progressive education onto the national scene (see pp. 108-109 of Cremin).

[25]Along with the obituary on Benne by Nash, the latter sent to me a short autobiography of his own career. I had hoped to get Nash to the University of Montana in some capacity--possibly as a lecturer--and I asked for the information to have on hand to reinforce my efforts to invite him to the campus.

[26]For example, "The Strange Death of Progressive Education," in Educational Theory, vol. xiv, #2, April, 1964, beginning on p. 65.

[27]In those years--roughly the decade of the sixties plus a few more--Boston University had an unusually fine program in the Foundations of Education. However, the controversial president of BU, John Silber (who went there in 1971) found the Foundations of Education program not to his liking and proceeded to virtually destroy it.

[28]Quote from Nash's obituary of Kenneth D. Benne, dated December, 1992.

[29]c. 1963, by Elizabeth Rugg (NY: Harper and Row). Although not an expert in the arts, the author of this paper (whf) has had a longtime interest in and appreciation of them. More to the point, Rugg, in Imagination is largely concerned with those breakthroughs in the intellectual realm which have led to new concepts, new syntheses which have helped humankind achieve additional upward steps on the road to human progress. Darwin's theory of evolution is a case in point, and re this and similar theorems which have enlightened

species homo-sapiens, Rugg's researches in intuition are ever present in the pages of this profound book.

[30]This is a small portion of a more lengthy statement by Brameld on the book's dust jacket.

[31]Quote from the Forward of Imagination, p. vii. It may be worth emphasizing (although I am working on this paper 30 years after the book was published) a partial rereading of Rugg's study leaves me with a feeling of awe. As the saying goes, I have to pinch myself when I realize that his man was once my teacher, and he was one who accepted me as a personal friend.

[32]James Earl Russell, the father of William F., was without doubt the leader who had developed TC into the leading graduate school of education in the United States. More than one of my friends on the faculty asserted that the elder dean made only one serious mistake--he saw to it that his sun succeeded him as dean.

[33]In my opinion, Professor Benne left TC because the University of Illinois was beckoning him as a place where philosophically he would feel more at home, and he had virtually no respect for William F. Russell as an educational leader. Interested readers of this paper may want to do more research on this question. One place to start may be my paper, delivered at the SW Philosophy of Education Society (10/30-11/1/75) entitled, "Harold Rugg--In Retrospect," in Proceedings, c.1976, the University of Oklahoma, Chipman G. Stuart, editor, pp.62-78. (The chronology as above stated is mostly gleaned from a bio-statement sent me by Ken's longtime friend, Paul E. Blackwood, 4000 Cathedral Ave. NW, Apt. 306B, Washington, D.C. 20016.)

[34]This reduces the question to the old environment/heredity problem. In lieu of a viable statement from the scientific community, I'll take a firm stand right on top of the fence. In short, I believe that inquisitiveness is, to an extent, actually born into some individuals. Then what happens after that largely depends on environmental circumstances.

[35] Charles Frankel was a name I used to hear bandied about among a number of faculty members at TC. And there were, of course, others including Karl Mannheim.

[36]See Chapter VII, "Can History Tell the Truth?" in Frankel's The Case for Modern Man, c.1955, 1956. The paperback edition I have used was published by the Beacon Press, 1959 by arrangement with Harper and Brothers.

[37]See Frankel, p.122.

[38]While the evidence is strong that Benne had respect for those who were proven authorities, at the same time he was enough of an independent spirit so that no one was doing his thinking for him. My use of Plato's Republic as an example is motivated by the thought that although philosophers as rulers may have been more effective in the sense of leadership than a person picked off the street; the point is that Plato's philosophers were not elected to their positions.

[39]Blackwood had been on the faculty of the Central Washington Normal School, Ellensburg, as a science instructor and I had grown up under the shadow of the Normal School in Bellingham which I attended for two years, and subsequently I attended the University of Washington receiving a bachelor of arts degree and teaching certification. I then taught social studies in the high schools of Wapato and Kirkland, in Washington.

[40]I elaborate to an extent on this phase of Benne's development hereinafter. Certainly, something like social attitudes is a statement germane to this discussion. The well-known humanist, Corliss Lamont, probably typifies what humanism is all about better than any other American. He has been an ardent defender of civil liberties and the National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, which he has chaired for a number of years, helps with legal assistance those whom the organization determines are in need of assistance in defence of their civil liberties. In other ways, Lamont's actions have been consistent with his precepts that human progress can only take place when causes are championed which are frequently unpopular with the majority of people. A statement consistent with my text, and one with which I feel certain Professor Benne would agree, is: A religious person is to be judged by his/her actions, not by what he/she says.

[41]Blackwood told me that Benne had been much interested in music all of his life.

[42]And it is well known that these German expatriates composed a significant, liberal force in American life across the years.

[43]These words are from Paul Nash's biography of KDB, as previously mentioned.

[44]Two of his better-known colleagues at TC, Columbia were R. Bruce Raup and John L. Childs. Both had prepared for the ministry (Childs was an actual, practicing preacher for a time) and they maintained an interest in problems related to religion long after they had given up the actual practice of the same. I am sure that others of liberal persuasion (including my own father, C.H. Fisher) went this route. In short, they had a deep and abiding interest in religion, but for a variety of reasons they never entered the ministry for which they had been prepared. Or, if they did enter it, they didn't stay there. However across the years, such individuals were typically characterized by active involvement in those causes they believed help to ameliorate some of the major ills of our society.

[45]I have made previous reference to Corliss Lamont. Other citations and other individuals representing liberal causes could easily be remembered and clearly mentioned. The point of emphasis is, in the thinking of many Americans one of the major tests of religion is to be found in an affirmative answer to the question "Is that person a religious person if he/she works virtually full-time trying to actively eliminate some of the ills of society?" This is one aspect of humanism; and, in my opinion, humanism is a kind of religion. On July 8th, 1993, subsequent to the writing of the foregoing statement, I had reason to believe that humanism as somekind

of religion may not fully explain Benne's orientation. As one always open to new ideas and the possible transformation of his beliefs, he was flexible and may have entertained a broader view of religion than one encompassed by the term humanism.

[46]My own religion does include a belief in individual, personal survival. At the same time I have tremendous respect for those who in their behavior, quite aside from what they think about traditional Christianity, are what I might call practicing Christians. (See previous reference to humanism.)

[47]His publications are so numerous as to, in a certain sense, tire one physically if I attempted to list them all. But, unlike so many of those who published widely, he was also a good teacher. We will add that among his published works were a goodly number of poems.

EFFECTIVE EDUCATION FOR AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS: A CULTURAL MODEL

Barley L. McSwine
Chicago State University

In his book *Experience and Education*, John Dewey assumes an organic connection between experience and education. "I assume that amid all uncertainties," he said, there is one permanent frame of reference: namely, the organic connection between education and personal experience. . . ." (Dewey, 1938, p. 25) Dewey, in fact, feels so strongly about this needed connection between personal experience and education that he develops a theory of experience which includes two principles: the principle of continuity and the principle of interaction. These principles "intercept and unite" according to Dewey, and are, ". . . the longitudinal and lateral aspects of experience." (Dewey, 1938, p. 44)

Therefore, agreeing with Dewey, and seeing this deficit in the education of African American students, I will argue in this paper, that it is this lost connection between personal experience (particularly that connected to historical culture) and education that is the root cause of black failure in today's schools. Dewey goes on to say:

> Different situations succeed one another. But because of the principle of continuity something is carried over from the earlier to the later ones. As an individual passes from one situation to another, his world, his environment, expands or contracts. He does not find himself living in another world but in a different part or aspect of one and the same world. What he has learned in the way of knowledge and skill in one situation becomes an instrument of understanding and dealing effectively with the situations which follow. The process goes on as long as life and learning continue. Otherwise the course of experience is disorderly, since the individual factor that enters into making an experience is split. A divided world, a world whose parts and aspects do not hang together, is at once a sign and a cause of a divided personality. When the splitting-up reaches a certain point we call the person insane. A fully integrated personality, on the other hand, exists only when successive experiences are integrated with one another. It can be built up only as a world of related objects is constructed. (Dewey, 1938, p. 44)

What Dewey is stressing here, I believe, insofar as quality of education is concerned, is not just curriculum continuity or whether successive aspects or gradations within the curriculum hang together pedagogically and provide the child with learning experiences that correspond to a particular stage of cognitive growth, but whether or not the entire culture of a school, including the curriculum, is built upon the cultural experiences that the child brings to the learning environment. In other words, is there continuity between the community and culture that the child comes from and the learning environment in which the child is placed. And if there is not this continuity and alignment, according to Dewey, a splitting occurs within the psyche or psychological makeup of the child which can lead to insanity or the disintegration of personality.

As early as 1902, W.E.B. DuBois spoke of this splitting of psyche in the black community as double consciousness. In his book The Souls of Black Folk, DuBois describes how this condition manifests itself:

> It is a peculiar sensation, this double-consciousness, this sense of always looking at one's self through the eyes of others, of measuring one's soul by the tape of a world that looks on in amused contempt and pity. One ever feels his twoness, — an American, a Negro; two souls, two thoughts, two unreconciled strivings; two warring ideals in one dark body . . . The history of the American Negro is the history of this strife, — this longing to attain self-conscious manhood, to merge his double self into a better and truer self. In this merging he wishes neither of the older selves to be lost. He would not Africanize America, for America has too much to teach the world and Africa. He would not bleach his Negro soul in a flood of white Americanism, for he knows that Negro blood has a message for the world. . . This, then, is the end of his striving: to be a coworker in the kingdom of culture, to escape both death and isolation, to husband and use his best powers and his latent genius. These powers of body and mind have in the past been strangely wasted, dispersed, or forgotten. The shadow of a mighty Negro past flits through the tale of Ethiopia the Shadowy and Egypt of the Sphinx." (DuBois, 1961, pp. 16-17)

Although these words were written by DuBois in 1903, they still apply to African Americans today. In a recently published book by Gerald Early, this question of identity is raised anew with eighteen African American writers of today. In the introduction to this collection of essays, Early describes the premise upon which the book is based: ". . . nearly two dozen black intellectuals and writers were invited to write essays on assimilation, race, and identity. . .." Early says. They were given the famous DuBois quotation as a kind of point of departure, something to get the brain cells working. . . They were free to write in any manner they wished. . . All are serious meditations by black people who are, in one way or another, deeply troubled by the America in which they live." (Early, 1993, p. xxii)

For me what was interesting about what these writers had to say was what they didn't say — which often spoke more loudly than what they said. For example, Molefi Asante and Stanley Crouch, two African American writers who could not be farther apart ideologically, (Asante, an Afrocentrist; and Crouch, a conservative's

neoconservative) spoke volumes in what they didn't say. Asante, for example, saying that he never suffered from the DuBoisian notion of double consciouness, nevertheless, does change his name from Arthur L. Smith to Molefi Asante because a librarian in Ghana assumed that the author of the book *The Rhetoric of Black Revolution* was white. Asante thus goes on to say that,

> The name Arthur L. Smith Jr., inherited from my father, had been betrayed by the dungeon of my American experience. . . I had no intention of ever masking or wanting to mask. I was straight up and down an African in my consciousness and that fact did not contradict my nationality as an American; it simply threw everything into the most ordered reality. (Early, 1993, p. 141)

What Asante misses here, and what was missed by the Ghanaian librarian that Asante encountered, is that his former name, as well as the reaction of the librarian, if anything, very strongly reveals the dungeon of his American experience. For his slave name was nothing less than a brand of identity of the former slave status of his ancestors, which ultimately reveals more about the moral bankruptcy of the slave holders than of the people who were enslaved. Thus, by changing his name, Asante was reacting out of a double consciousness that he did not know he had, an unconscious mask that he wore (his slave name) which he had to shed in order to make clear to the world who he really was.

Stanley Crouch, on the other hand, in striving to be an individualist, derides DuBois' concept of double consciousness as simply being the product of a person who was wrong headed and lost to miscegenation. What Crouch reveals about himself is that not only has he not read DuBois work, but that he has misunderstood what he little he has read. Generations of black writers from Toni Morrison to Haki Madhubuti, from Ralph Ellison to James Baldwin, Richard Wright and Frantz Fanon have dealt with the problem of identity in the black community in one way or another. And yet Crouch apparently does not see the issue of double consciousness as an identity problem because he cannot see beyond his own level of oppression. Thus, while manifesting all the symptoms of the split, he has intellectualized them away.

For me, personally, it was first Baldwin and then Fanon who helped me to become aware of the question of identity in my own life and later to connect it with oppression and colonialism. In books like *Nobody Knows My Name*, *No Name In The Street*, and *Black Skin, White Masks*, Baldwin and Fanon address how this pathology, now so apparent in the black community, is connected to the historical legacy of the effects of oppression and colonialism.

Some years later, a further connection was made for me by Carter G. Woodson — the connection between identity, oppression and education. In his 1933 book, The Mis-Education of the Negro, Woodson, a Harvard trained historian, describes the predicament of African Americans which has many parallels to what is happening today. "In history," Woodson says, ". . . the Negro had no place in this curriculum. . . No thought was given to the history of Africa except so far as it had been a field of exploitation for the Caucasian. . . You would never thereby learn that Africans first domesticated the sheep, goat, and cow, developed the idea of trial by jury, produced the first stringed instruments, and gave the world its greatest boon in the discovery of iron." (Woodson, 1933, p. 21)

Woodson here is obviously talking about the lack of curriculum content on African Americans. However, he goes on to criticize Negro teachers as being well-meaning, but as products of the system that oppresses them, end up perpetuating that very system. (See, for example, Woodson, 1933, pp. 22-23) While many might think Woodson off-base, of perhaps even un-American, what is often missed by even well-meaning scholars and educators are the on-going psychological consequences of oppression in the black community which are a direct result of the mis-education that Woodson criticizes.

Abram Kardiner and Lionel Ovesey addressed this problem back in the late 1940's in their book The Mark Of Oppression. They found that a key to understanding black behavior is the concept of adaptation. This refers to psychological devices that human beings use to ensure their health and survival in a social environment. Adaptation among blacks, they felt, manifests itself in six major forms: 1) degradation of self-esteem; 2) destruction of cultural forms and adoption of foreign cultural traits; 3) destruction of the family unit, with particular disparagement to the male; 4) relative enhancement of the female status, thus making her the central figure in the culture; 5) the destruction of social cohesion by the inability to have their own culture; and, 6) the idealization of the oppressor who is at once revered and hated. (Kardiner and Ovesey, 1951, p. 47)

Although Kardiner and Ovesey published their book over forty years ago, current conditions suggest that these factors continue to reek havoc in the social and psychological fabric of the black community. Thus, for example, the dropout rate for young blacks has continued to climb and has reached fifty percent in many innercity public educational institutions. And while SAT and ACT scores have begun to climb among those black students in school, the problems of drugs, violence, pregnancy and alienation continue to get worse.

At this point, if one reflects on Dewey's principles of continuity and interaction as the criteria for experience in education (and, I might add, his criteria for mental health as well), it is clear that a major violation of these principles has occurred and continues to occur insofar as the education of African American students is concerned. This violation happens on a variety of levels; however, I feel that the one we should be most concerned about is the cultural context in which black children are educated. Thus, my call for a cultural model of education for African American students grows out of not only my concern for a lack of cultural continuity and the resulting cognitive dissonance, but, also out of a major pedagogical violation as well.

The model I wish to propose is an Afrocentric or African centered contextual model that grows out of the work of scholars such as W.E.B. DuBois, Edward Hall, Melville Herskovits, Uri Triesman, Carter G. Woodson, Kwame Akoto, Wade Nobles and Asa Hilliard to name a few. Hilliard, for example, in a recent address to the Canal School Project teachers in Chicago (August 1993) cited the phenomenal success the Marcus Garvey school in Los Angeles and the Rice school in Dallas have had in teaching African American students. In his discription of these schools, it quickly becomes apparent that the

learning environment within these schools capitalizes on what Hall has identified as the microcultural background of these students. (Hall, 1989, p. 24) In other words, the learning environment in which these students are immersed seems to be structured in such a way to capitalize on the learning style and cultural context in which African Americans learn best. Hilliard describes these characteristics as follows:

> 1. [African] American people tend to respond to things in terms of the whole picture instead of its parts. The Euro-American tends to believe that anything can be divided and subdivided into pieces and that these pieces add up to a whole. Therefore, art is sometimes taught by numbers, as are dancing and music. . .
>
> 2. [African] American people tend to prefer inferential reasoning to deductive or inductive reasoning.
>
> 3. [African] American people tend to approximate space, numbers, and time rather than stick to accuracy.
>
> 4. [African] American people tend to prefer to focus on people and their activities rather than on things. This tendency is shown by the fact that so many Black students choose careers in the helping professions, such as teaching, psychology, social work, and so forth, even though a scarcity of jobs exist in those areas and the curriculum is not particularly easy.
>
> 5. [African] American people have a keen sense of justice and are quick to analyze and perceive injustice.
>
> 6. [African] American people tend to lean toward altruism, a concern for one's fellow man.
>
> 7. [African] American people tend to prefer novelty, freedom, and personal distinctiveness. This is shown in the development of improvisations in music and styles of clothing.
>
> 8. [African] American people in general tend not to be "word" dependent. They tend to be very proficient in nonverbal communications. (As cited in Bennett, 1990, pp. 158-159)

Hall describes this particular approach to learning as high context learning, which he says grows out of high context cultural environments. He makes a distinction between high and low context cultures and their approaches to communication and interpreting their environments.

> Low context cultures are those in which there is a widely-shared assumption — and behavior to support that assumption — that the amount of stored knowledge on the part of one's interlocutor is minimal. That is, there is a need to tell everybody everything in great detail. . . In sharp contrast, high context peoples like the Pueblo, many of Africa's indigenous cultures, the Japanese, and apparently the Russians, do not construct meaning in their daily live so much as they "extract it" from the environment and the situation. That is, they inhabit a sea of information that is widely shared. This insight would explain Japanese antipathy to Western logic. . . It is this fact that has proved to be one of the major (but hidden) stumbling blocks at the interface between American-European education and the culture of . . . the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico. (Hall, 1989, pp. 25-27)

Microculture, according to Hall, and microcultural analysis, grow out of microanthropology which focuses on the analysis of very small cultural details and those aspects of culture that for the most part operate outside the level of awareness. Some of the categories for analysis that fall within the realm of microculture are the uses of time, the uses of space, the uses of rhythm and tempo, approaches to reasoning, uses of non-verbal versus verbal messages, social roles, interpersonal relations and social organization.

Finally, in summary, I think that what we can safely say about Hall's work as well as that of the other scholars I have cited, is that an optimum learning environment for African American students must be culturally based. It must go beyond simply raising SAT and ACT scores; beyond assessing the quality of education that black Americans receive by counting how many graduate from high school and college who are literate and can go directly into the job market. It must begin to focus on who the African American student is and what his core identity should be. It must take into account the impact and legacy of slavery, as well as the impact of sexism and classism on the psychological health and cohesiveness of the African American community.

It must, in the final analysis, understand that the pedagogy used for the education of African American students should include all of the microcultural factors identified by Hall which are currently embedded in and manifest through African American culture: factors which are indigenous carryovers from a heritage that continues to define, create, empower, and protect the black community. The current fragmentation and growing tragedy of self-destructiveness that we now see within the African American community says that the model which I am proposing is nothing less than a sine qua non for survival and success that is not defined by the alienation and materialism that currently defines American society.

Bibliography

Asante, M. The Afrocentric Idea. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1987.

Baldwin, J. Nobody Knows My Name. New York: Bantam Doubleday Dell Publishing Group, Inc., 1961.

———— No Name In The Street. New York: Bantam Doubleday Dell Publishing Group, Inc., 1972.

Ballard, A. The Education of Black Folk. New York: Harper and Row, 1973.

Bennett, C. Comprehensive Multicultural Educa-

tion. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1990.

Cheyney, A. Teaching Children of Different Cultures in The Classroom. Columbus: Merrill Publishing Co., 1976.

Dewey, J. The School and Society/The Child and The Curriculum. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990. (originally published in 1900 and 1902 respectively)

———— Experience and Education. New York: Collier Books, 1938.

DuBois, W.E.B. The Souls of Black Folk. Greenwich: Fawcett Publications Inc., 1961. (originally published in 1903)

———— The Education of Black People. H. Aptheker (ed.) New York: Monthly Review Press, 1973.

Early, G. Lure and Loathing. New York: Penguin Publishing Co., 1993.

Fanon, F. The Wretched of The Earth. New York: Grove Press, Inc. 1963.

——— Black Skin, White Masks. New York: Grove Press, Inc. 1967.

Hale-Benson, J. Black Children: Their Roots, Culture, and Learning Styles. rev. ed. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1986.

Hall, E. An Anthropology of Everyday Life. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

——— "Unstated Features of The Cultural Context of Learning," in The Educational Forum Vol. 54, No. 1, Fall, 1989.

——— Beyond Culture. Garden City: Double day, 1976.

Herskovitz, M. The Myth of The Negro Past. Boston: Beacon Press, 1958.

Kardiner, A., and L. Ovesey. The Mark of Oppression. Cleveland: World Publishing Co., 1951.

Karenga, M. and J. Carruthers (eds.) Kemet and The African Worldview. Los Angeles: University of Sankore Press, 1986.

Lomotey, K (ed.) Going To School: The African American Experience. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1990.

Nobles, W. "Ancient Egyptian Thought and The Renaissance of African (Black) Psychology," in Kemet and The African Worldview. M. Karenga and J. Carruthers (eds.) Los Angeles; University of Sankore Press, 1986.

Smith, W. and E. Chunn. Black Education: A Quest for Excellence. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1989.

Witkin, H. A., C.A. Moore, D.R. Goodenough, and P. W. Cox. "Field-Dependent and Field-Independent Cognitive Styles and Their Educational Implications," in Review of Educational Research Vol. 47, No. 1, 1977, pp. 1-64.

Woodson, C. G. The Mis-Education of The Negro. Trenton: African World Press, Inc., 1990 (originally published in 1933).

THOMAS JEFFERSON AFTER 250 YEARS

Jed Arthur Cooper
University of North Texas

During my childhood and youth, I was aware that Thomas Jefferson was someone special. Otherwise, he would no share Mr. Rushmore with Washington, Lincoln, Teddy Roosevelt. He could not have been as special as Washington and Lincoln, however, because we didn't take not of this birthday like we did theirs. On my first visit to Washington, D.C. in 1957 I went to the Jefferson Memorial on the Tidal Basin, but I was not as impressed with it as I was with the Lincoln Memorial or the Washington Monument. I appreciated the fact that Jefferson had authored the Declaration of American Independence, but didn't fully realize what a tremendous accomplishment that was. To me, Jefferson remained somewhat of an enigma. In graduate school I learned that he had advocated some public education as early as 1779 in his bill for the more general diffusion of knowledge in Virginia, a bill which was defeated. As the years passed, I remained rather ignorant of Jefferson, rejecting him subconsciously perhaps because he was honored each year at dinners throughout the country as the founder of the Democratic Party. Early in 1993 I read that this year marked the 250th anniversary of his birth and decided that I should no longer remain ignorant nor indifferent to him and his contributions. During the past several months I have done considerable reading of and about Jefferson and have become a genuine admirer of this remarkable man.

Although born on the fringe of the frontier in sparsely-settled Albemarle County, Virginia, Jefferson's childhood and youth were not spent in an impoverished condition. As the third child and eldest son of Peter and Jane Randolph Jefferson, he was given the educational advantages and opportunities reserved for the Virginia gentry. Although he was appreciative of his opportunities, there is no evidence that he was particularly proud of his aristocratic ancestry.

Jefferson was very close to his father whose physical strength, surveying skills, and ability to survive in the wilderness he greatly admired. From him and other tutors he learned to read and write, to do farm accounts, and picked up the conventional Anglican religious precepts. Young Tom also learned to play the violin and developed a great appreciation for music. At the age of nine he was sent to a boarding school conducted by a minister who Jefferson later described as "a superficial Latinist" and less instructed in Greek." Nevertheless, he began here to acquire skill in classical languages which became so important in his life-long learning.

When Jefferson was fourteen his father died. As the oldest son, he became head of the family and inherited the Shadwell estate wit its 2,500 acres of land and thirty slaves. His guardian, John Harvey, managed the estate, however, and in accordance with his late father's desire, Jefferson enrolled in Reverend James Maury's Latin school Maury was a "correct classical scholar" who helped him develop the ability to read Greek and Roman authors in the original. He also gave him an appreciation for the beauty of the English language.

At sixteen Jefferson entered the College of William and Mary at Williamsburg. Although it was Virginia's capital, Williamsburg had a population of only a thousand and the college had an enrollment of only a hundred students. There were only seven faculty members including the president. Six of the seven were Anglican ministers. The other, William Small, had a great influence on Jefferson. Except for a short time, Small was his only regular teacher. With a rational and scientific mind, Small increased Jefferson's interest in the useful sciences and as the only layman on the faculty probably contributed to his anticlericalism.

Small made another important contribution to Jefferson's intellectual development by introducing him to George Wythe, a prominent jurist with whom Jefferson studied law for five years after graduating from college in 1762. Small and Wythe were close friends of the Royal Governor, Francis Gauquier, and erudite man of great taste and refinement. Jefferson related well to that trio of friends and was frequently invited to the palace for dinner, conversation, and entertainment. Through Governor Fauquier, he met many of the leading politicians and attended sessions of the General Court. Many years later, Jefferson remembered Williamsburg as "the finest school of manners and morals that ever existed in America."

While standing in the doorway to the House of Burgesses, a twenty-two years old Jefferson heard Patrick Henry deliver his famous "liberty or death" speech against the Stamp Act. Being much impressed with the fiery speech, the young law student would soon enlist his own energy in the cause of American independence.

Jefferson was admitted to the bar in 1767 and established a rather successful practice specializing in land settlements. He lived part of the time in Williamsburg and the remainder at Shadwell where he designed and supervised the construction of his own home, Monticello, on a hill nearby.

Jefferson married a young widow, Martha Wayles Skelton, in 1772. It is said that his love of music and his ability to play the violin helped him win his bride. One day two other suitors appeared at Martha's home, but when they heard her and Jefferson playing duets on the violin and the harpsichord they quickly withdrew without a word! The young couple settled at the unfinished Monticello and had a family of one son and five daughters. Only two children, Martha and Mary, lived to maturity. Mrs. Jefferson died after ten years of marriage and Jefferson never remarried. It was reported that he promised his wife on her deathbed that he would never marry again. He did care for his two surviving daughters.

Forty years of near continuous public service began when Jefferson was elected to the House of Burgesses in 1769. For all practical purposes his law practice came to an end. He joined with Patrick Henry, Richard Henry Lee, and Francis Lightfoot Lee in their efforts to break the control of the Tidewater aristocrats over Virginia politics and to protest the import duties imposed by the Townshend Acts passed by the British Parliament.

In 1774 Jefferson called for a meeting of all the colonies to consider their grievances against the British. He was selected to represent Albemarle County at the First Virginia Convention which was to elect delegates to the First Continental Congress. Due to illness he could not attend the meeting, but he did send a paper expressing his views on relationships between the colonies and England. He argued that government had been established in the American colonies for the benefit of the colonists, not for the English. The British Parliament had no more right to govern the colonies than the German states had to govern England. His views were published in a pamphlet entitled, "A Summary View of the Rights of British America." By this time it had become clear that Jefferson was a gifted writer although his talents were limited as a public speaker.

In the spring of 1775 Jefferson attended the Second Virginia Convention where he was chosen as a delegate to the Second Continental Congress. There he played a leading role. Sentiment in favor of independence grew strong during the spring of 1776. On June 7, Richard Henry Lee of Virginia introduced a resolution that "these United colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States." Congress appointed a committee to draw up an official declaration of independence. This committee unanimously requested that Jefferson prepare the draft which was submitted to Congress with few changes. Debate on the declaration was begun on June 28, and it was adopted on July 4. A few changes were made by the Congressmen, but Richard Lee exclaimed, "the Thing in its nature is so good that no cookery can spoil the dish for the palates of freemen."

The Declaration of Independence is certainly Jefferson's most famous work. It eloquently affirms strong legal arguments a belief in representative government under a constitution. Few of its ideas were original with Jefferson. He drew upon the works of great thinkers from classical times down to his own day. He said his purpose was "to place before mankind the common sense of the subject, in terms so plain and firm as to command their assent...Neither aiming at originality of principle or sentiment, nor yet copied from any particular and previous writing, it was intended to be an expression of the American mind..."

Jefferson resigned from congress and returned to the Virginia House of Delegates in September, 1776. He introduced legislation to bring about land reform by abolishing entail and primogeniture. Great estates could then be broken up with more people owning property and having the right to vote. Jefferson saw this as a means of replacing an "aristocracy of wealth" with an "aristocracy of virtue and talent."

One of Jefferson's most important bills was his statute for religious freedom which disestablished the Anglican Church and guaranteed religious liberty in Virginia. He took great pride in the passage of this act and observed in a letter to James Madison that "...it is honorable for us to have produced the first legislature who had the courage to declare that the reason of man may be trusted with the formation of his own opinions." He incurred the wrath of many who feared that separation of church and state would create a society of infidels. For many years he was strongly criticized as an atheist by his political enemies.

Jefferson worked to revise Virginia's legal system pushing through many reforms in criminal law. His efforts resulted in a more humane system of criminal justice.

While a member of the legislature, Jefferson proposed an elaborate system of public education and state-supported university. He was convinced that an educated citizenry was essential to the successful working of a democracy. "If a nation expects to be ignorant and free in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be."

Jefferson's Bill for the More General Diffusion of Knowledge called for publicly supported elementary and secondary schools and a secular university. Every county would be divided into wards, each sufficiently large to maintain an elementary school. The curriculum would include reading, writing, and arithmetic with special emphasis on books in ancient, British, and American history. To provide schooling for the poor, Jefferson's plan proposed that "at these schools all the free children, male and female, resident within the respective hundred (ward), shall be entitled to receive tuition gratis, for the term of three years, and as much longer, at their private expense, as their parents, guardians or friends, shall think proper."

Jefferson believed that the state had a responsibility to seek out and cultivate leaders of the natural aristocracy as well as to provide general education for the masses. So he proposed that twenty state supported secondary-level boarding schools be established at appropriate locations with a curriculum that would include English grammar, geography, and higher mathematics in addition to the traditional Greek and Latin. One boy of great ability whose parents could no afford to pay for additional schooling was to be selected annually from each elementary school and given one year at state expense in the secondary school. After this year, one-third of the group of "public foundationers" would be discontinued. After a second year, all the rest "save one only, the best in genius and disposition," would end their formal education. The one best student in each secondary school would continue his schooling free of charge for four additional years. "By this means, twenty of the best geniuses will be raked from the rubbish annually, and be instructed, at the public expense, so far as the grammar schools go." Jefferson also proposed that at the end of the six years of grammar school, half the "scholarship" students would end their schooling and the other half, chosen "for the superiority of their parts and disposition," would entitled to three years of study at state expense in the College of William and Mary.

Despite Jefferson's enthusiasm for his public education proposals, he was unable to get his bill through the Virginia Legislature. The wealthy were simply unwilling the carry the burden of educating the poor. The defeat of the bill did not end Jefferson's interest in the cause of public education. Within a year of the bill's rejection, Jefferson wrote to James Madison "I hope the education of the common people will be attended to; convinced that on their good sense we may rely with the most security for the preservation of a due degree of liberty."

Jefferson was elected governor for one-year terms in 1779 and 1780 by the Virginia Assembly. During his administration Virginia was attacked by British Troops and was unable to mount a strong defense. At General George Washington's request, most of the militia had been sent to assist in the federal war effort. Jefferson

barely escaped capture when British troops swept down on Monticello in 1781. Shortly thereafter his second term ended and the legislature re-elected him. He refused to serve another term, however, because he believed the governor at that time should be a military man. He was heavily criticized for fleeing from the British forces and resigning as governor before a successor could be elected. Although an investigation committee of the House of Delegates cleared Jefferson of any blame, the attacks hurt him deeply. He was genuinely relieved to get out of public office.

Determined to remain out of public life forever, Jefferson returned to Monticello and began to write his Notes on Virginia, a book which established him as a first-rate author.

Jefferson was devastated by the death of his wife in September, 1782. He was elected to Congress in 1783 and accepted the office believing that it might help him take him mind off the loss of his beloved companion.

Jefferson's year in Congress was most successful. He obtained Congressional approval of the Treaty of Paris which ended the Revolutionary War, devised a decimal system of currency adopted by Congress, and drafted the Land Ordinances of 1784 and 1785. Through the land ordinances he endeavored to forbid slavery west of the Appalachians, but this provision was defeated by a single vote. Although the Ordinance of 1784 never became law, it provided the basis for the Northwest Ordinance of 1787. The Northwest Ordinance shows Jefferson's continuing support for the idea of public education by declaring, "Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary of good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged."

Congress sent Jefferson to France in May, 1784, to work with John Adams and Benjamin Franklin in negotiating European commercial treaties. Franklin resigned the following year and Jefferson succeeded him as America's minister to France in Paris. When asked, "It is you, sir, who replace Franklin?" Jefferson replied, "No, sir, I succeed him; no one can replace him."

Jefferson achieved considerable success despite being handicapped by the weak central authority of the United States under the Articles of Confederation. As the revolution was approaching in France, Jefferson tried to keep out of French politics, but he did draft a proposed Charter of Rights for presentation to the king. When the French Revolution began, he was sympathetic to i because he thought its purpose was similar to that of the American Revolution.

Jefferson's daughter, Martha, had accompanied him to France. In 1787, his youngest daughter, Mary, joined them. She was accompanied by a thirteen-year-old slave girl, Sally Hemings, a daughter of Jefferson's chef, James Hemings. Described as a beautiful, light mulatto girl, some writers have tried to depict Sally as the concubine of a lonely, lovesick Jefferson both in France and a Monticello after their return home. To this day, historians argue over the authenticity of this charge.

It is certain, however, that Jefferson fell deeply in love with Maria Cosway, an English miniature portrait painter, the moment he first say her in Paris. She had accompanied her husband Richard, England's foremost miniaturist painter of the time, to Paris on a professional assignment. Apparently, Maria loathed Richard, who was nearly twenty years older than she, and responded favorably to Jefferson's attentions. For a two month period while Richard Cosway was busy with his miniatures, Maria accompanied Jefferson on daily carriage rides to galleries, museums, and remote gardens in and around Paris. After they had been seeing each other for about six weeks, Jefferson was so excited as he sat out to visit her that he fell while jumping over a small fountain and broke his wrist. He was in physical pain for the remainder of their association together. His greatest pain was psychological, however, when her said goodbye and helped her into her husband's carriage as she returned to London. He later wrote her that as her turned and walked away he was "more dead than alive."

Jefferson thought Maria would return to Paris the next spring and that together they would visit her birthplace in Italy. They also talked about the possibility of her visiting at Monticello. But they never saw each other again and their correspondence became infrequent. Jefferson saved all her letters and copies of all his letters to her. As a result, one day his children and grandchildren would know just how much he had loved Maria Cosway.

Jefferson traveled widely in Europe and broadened his knowledge of many things. He was particularly interested in architecture and agricultural practices.

His daughters had been attending a convent school in Paris and Jefferson began to worry that they might convert to Catholicism. He decided that he should take them back to Virginia, so he applied for a leave in 1789 and sailed for home in October. He fully expected to return to his post in France.

While Jefferson was in France, Americans were busy restructuring their government. A new constitution was drafted in 1787. James Madison sent his friend Jefferson a copy of the draft. Jefferson approved it, but objected to the lack of a bill of rights. He wrote letters urging one, so Madison introduced the ten amendments which became the Bill of Rights.

The Constitution had been adopted by the time Jefferson returned to the United States in 1789 and a letter from President George Washington awaited him. It requested that Jefferson became Secretary of State in the new government. Finally yielding to Washington's pleas, he accepted the new post "with real regret." Washington supported most of Jefferson's foreign-policy initiatives, but sharp differences arose between Jefferson and Secretary of the Treasury Alexander Hamilton. These differences grew into a bitter persona feud with neither man believing in the honesty or good faith of the other. Their conflicting views provided the basis for the first political parties in the United States. The Federalists adopted Hamilton's principles and the Democratic-Republicans were directed by Jefferson. Hamilton distrusted the common people and believed that the country could best be governed by an aristocracy of the rich and wellborn. With his faith in the people, Jefferson believed the "that government is best which governs least."

Jefferson urged Washington to accept a second term as President, but asked that he be relieved as Secretary of State during the second term. He was tired of public office. Returning to Monticello in January, 1794, he expected to find happiness "in the society of my neighbors and my books, in the wholesome occupations of my farm and my affairs..."

Although Jefferson thoroughly enjoyed his life at Monticello, he became concerned with the centralizing

tendencies of the government. He was afraid that Federalist ideas were going to deprive Americans of the personal and political freedoms they had fought so hard to obtain in the Revolutionary War, those freedoms vouchsafed by the Constitution. So he accepted the Democratic-Republican nomination for President in 1796 and ran against Federalist John Adams.

Adams defeated Jefferson who received the second-highest number of electoral votes to become Vice-President. Except for presiding over the Senate, Jefferson did not take an active part in the new administration because it was primarily Federalist. He worked diligently, however, to strengthen the Democratic-Republican Party. Relations between him and Adams grew strained and they broke completely in 1800.

Jefferson defeated Adams for the presidency in 1800. That election campaign is considered one of the dirtiest in American political history. Jefferson's enemies hired a hack political writer, James Callender, to disseminate charges of a flirtation with his marries neighbor, Betsy Walker, in 1768 and to include lurid descriptions of Sally Hemings arriving from Paris pregnant with Jefferson's child, the first of several he supposedly sired by her as she became his mistress at Monticello. Jefferson admitted that as a very young man he had on one occasion made a pass at Mrs. Walker who rejected his overtures, but he refused to dignify Callender's charges publicly. Privately, he denied the charges of having a slave family with Sally Hemings. Historians generally dismissed the Callender charges for nearly two hundred years until the late Fawn M. Brodie, while researching her biography, Thomas Jefferson: An Intimate History, chose to give credence to an inaccurate and uncorroborated memoir by a man who claimed to be Madison Jefferson, a son of Jefferson and Sally Hemings. This memoir was first published in 1873. The Jefferson family maintains that Sally Hemings's children who were said to resemble Jefferson were actually sired by Jefferson's nephew, Samuel Carr.

Jefferson felt that after twelve years of Federalism his administration would save the nation from tyranny. His inaugural address was quire conciliatory, however, and the government continued much as before. He started having guest shake hands with the President rather than bow. He also had dinner guests seated at round tables so all would be equal. In general, he tried to remove all monarchical trappings of the office.

Life in the White House was rather lonely for Jefferson who kept a pet mockingbird for company. His daughters, Martha and Mary, served as hostesses from time to time although they did not live in Washington. Dolley Madison, wife of the Secretary of State, was Jefferson's most popular hostess.

The most notable achievement of Jefferson's first term was the purchase of Louisiana Territory from France in 1803. This doubled the land area of the United States. A prosperous nation easily re-elected Jefferson in 1804, completely defeating the Federalists.

Although many people urged Jefferson to run for a third term in 1808, he chose to follow George Washington's example and retire. He endorsed James Madison to be the next President and he won easily.

Jefferson was 65 when he retired from the presidency and returned to Monticello. He was genuinely pleased to be free of public duties and able to cultivate his countless interests in agriculture, music, architecture, science, philosophy, education, law and religion.

As the elder Sage of Monticello, Jefferson entertained many guests who came to pay their respects. He carried on a heavy correspondence and gave solicited advice to both Madison and James Monroe, his two successors in the presidency. He reconciled with John Adams in 1811 to the joy of both. Their letters continued until both died on the same day, July 4, 1826.

As an elder statesman, Jefferson's major efforts were in education, particularly in founding the University of Virginia. That institution is still frequently referred to as "Mr. Jefferson's University." Its architectural and academic designs were the product on one man's vision.

Although academic freedom was not a term to be found in the early nineteenth century vocabulary, Jefferson insisted that the curriculum "be based on the illimitable freedom of the human mind to explore and to expose every subject susceptible of its contemplation." He also declared, "Here we are not afraid to follow truth wherever it may lead, not to tolerate any error, so long as reason is left free to combat it." In education, as well as in politics and religion, reason was to be the final arbiter on one's belief. The University of Virginia would have no church affiliation and no professor of divinity. No religious demands would be made on either students or faculty.

In addition to freedom from religious constraints, students were free to explore a more comprehensive range of studies that was typical at the time. Not only did the curriculum contain classical studies, but also all the bronchus of useful science such as architecture, advanced mathematics, medicine and anatomy, politics, and law.

Jefferson was the first person to insist upon an elective system. "We shall allow them uncontrolled choice in the lectures they shall choose to attend..." He also avoided long lists of rules for student conduct, preferring to treat students "as men and gentlemen, under the guidance mainly of their own discretion."

Determined that his professors should enjoy the "illimitable freedom of the human mind," Jefferson gave them tenure for life and the assurance that they would be unmolested internally or externally.

On the 250th anniversary of Jefferson's birth, it is good to review his life and understand his total commitment to the inherent and unalienable rights of human beings. It is good to affirm his belief in universal schooling as an essential to democratic government.

NOTES

Brodie, Fawn M. Thomas Jefferson: An Intimate History (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1974).

Randall, Willard Stern Thomas Jefferson: A Life (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1993).

Wagoner, Jennings L., Jr. Thomas Jefferson and the Education of a New Nation (Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, 1976).

The World Book Encyclopedia (Chicago: Field Enterprises, 1975), Vol. 11.

Forty-Fourth Annual Business Meeting
of the
Southwestern Philosophy of Education Society
New Orleans, Louisiana
September 24, 1993

Presiding: Wayne Willis, President, 1992-1993

The Minutes of the September 25, 1992 meeting, were approved as distributed.

Mary-Lou Aylor gave the Treasurer's Report:

Income		Expenses	
1992-93 Balance	$349.72	Journal Publications	$973.25
		Clerical Fees	
Dues & Registration	$3,421.00	Copyright Fees	
TOTAL	$3,770.72	TOTAL	$973.25

Balance:

Income	$3,770.72
Expenses	$973.25
	$2,797.47

It was announced that the Journal of Thought had been transferred from Northern Illinois University to Alan H. Jones at Prakken Publications.

Rusty Curtis discussed the importance of continuing our contribution to the Council for Learned Societies in Education (CLSE). All those interested in making a contribution could make a check out to SWPES.

Wayne Willis the editor of the Journal of Educational Philosophy and History discussed future issues of the Journal. It was announced that all submissions be on a 3½ inch disk and follow the MLA guidelines contained in the 1988 edition of the Handbook for Writer's of Research Papers. Instructions for submitting papers will be listed in the front of future editions of the Journal. In addition, it was determined that subsequent editions would follow the volume numbers of the Proceedings; therefore the 1994 edition would be Volume XLIV. The deadline for submissions for the 1994 edition will be December 1, 1993. Papers received after this date will not be included in the Journal.

The Executive Committee nominated Richard Elliott for President-elect. The nomination was approved by acclamation.

Wayne Willis announced that the Society would be meeting at the University of Arkansas in Fayetteville, Arkansas, September 21-23, 1994. Mario Benitez discussed the possibility of having the

1995 meeting in Cancun, Mexico City, or Guadalajara, Mexico. The Society gave him their complete support to explore the possibility.

Clint Allison announced that the Southern History of Education Society would be meeting March 18-19, 1994, at the University of Tennessee in Knoxville. Possible topics of interest include: the history of higher education and the history of teacher education.

Martha Tevis announced that Lucy Townsend is chairing the meeting of the International Society for Educational Biography to be held in Chicago, in April 1994.

Jim Van Patten announced that the Southern Futures Society would meet in April 1994, in Little Rock, Arkansas.

Karen McKellips announced that a conference on "Diversity" would be held at Cameron University in Lawton, Oklahoma in April 1994.

Martha Tevis moved to change the name of the Southwestern Philosophy of Education Society to the Society for Educational Philosophy and History. The motion was seconded by Bill Fisher. Another lively discussion followed. Bill Cowert said that he felt the name of the organization would be descriptive and appropriate. The motion passed by a vote of 23 to 6, with 2 abstentions.

The meeting adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Timothy J. Bergen, Jr.
Secretary

Forty-third Annual Business Meeting
of the
Southwestern Philosophy of Education Society

San Antonio, Texas

September 25, 1992

Presiding: David Snelgrove, President, 1991-1992

The Minutes of the September 27, 1991 meeting, were approved as distributed.

Mary-Lou Aylor gave the Treasurer's Report:

Income:		Expenses:		Balance:	
1991-2 Balance	$ 464.51	Banquet	$1,057.50	Income	$2,658.01
Dues, Registr.		Hospitality Fee	150.00	Expenses	-2,462.84
& Proceedings	2,193.50	Proceedings	1,255.34	Balance	$ 195.17
	$2,658.01		$2,462.84		

The Executive Committee nominated Mary-Lou Aylor for President-elect. The nomination was approved by acclamation.

David Snelgrove announced that the Society would be meeting at the Monteleone Hotel in New Orleans, from September 23 to 25, 1993. The 1994 meeting is scheduled for Fayetteville, Arkansas.

Wayne Willis, editor of the Proceedings discussed some of the problems of publishing the Proceedings. Wayne said that Morehead State University will be unable to commit any money to the typing of the manuscripts. Wayne proposed that everyone should submit their paper on a 3½-inch disk along with one hard copy. The motion was seconded and passed.

Wayne announced that the deadline for submitting papers for this year is December 1, 1992. Papers received after this date will not be able to be included in the Proceedings.

It was moved to change the title of the Proceedings to the Journal of Educational History and Philosophy. Martha Tevis seconded the motion. After a lengthy discussion, Chuck Fazzaro moved to amend the original motion to change the name to the Journal of Educational Philosophy and History: Publication of the Southwestern Philosophy of Education Society. The motion was seconded and passed.

Martha Tevis discussed the willingness of Glenn Smith to turn over the Journal of Thought to another university. Ron Reed was said to be interested in editing the Journal with the assistance of Jim Bowman at the University of Central Arkansas. It was suggested that Wayne Willis, President for 1992-93, contact Glenn immediately in order to expedite the transition as soon as possible.

Dick Elliott moved to suspend the SWPES contribution to the Council for Learned Societies in Education (CLES). Donna Younker commented that she would personally contribute $50 in order to give SWPES a voice in the organization. Martha Tevis suggested we solicit private contributions from our membership. Rusty Curtis moved

that we solicit $150 in private donations for one year. The motion was seconded and passed. Checks should be made out to SWPES and Mary Lou Aylor will forward all donations to CLSE in the name of the Society.

Jim Van Patten announced that the Southern Futures Society will hold its annual meeting at the Excelsior Hotel in Little Rock, Arkansas, from April 1-3, 1993. All submitted papers should be on a 3½-inch disk. The theme of the conference will be "Creating Alternative Futures."

Clint Allison announced that the Southern History of Education Society will be meeting in Knoxville in mid-March of 1993.

Lou Goldman moved to change the name of the Society from the Southwestern Philosophy of Education Society to the Society for Philosophy and History of Education. The motion was seconded and another lively discussion followed. The motion failed by a vote of 12 to 11.

Martha Tevis reminded everyone who had not paid their dues to the Texas Educational Foundations Society, to please do so.

Mary Lou Aylor moved that the following fee structure to established:

Dues	$ 2.00
Journal (subscription)	$18.00
Registration	$20.00
Total	$40.00

The motion was seconded and passed.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Timothy J. Bergen, Jr.

Timothy J. Bergen, Jr.
Secretary

Forty-Fourth Annual Meeting

THE SOUTHWESTERN PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION SOCIETY

September 23-25, 1993
Monteleone Hotel
New Orleans, Louisiana

in cooperation with

The Department of Educational Leadership, Counseling, and Foundations

The University of New Orleans

and

Phi Delta Kappa, UNO Chapter

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Southwestern Philosophy of Education Society 1993-94

Officers

President	Wayne Willis Morehead State University
President Elect	Mary Lou Aylor Central Michigan University
Immediate Past President	David Snelgrove Oklahoma City Schools
Secretary	Tim Bergen University of South Carolina
Historian	Clinton Allison University of Tennessee
Journal Editor	Wayne Willis Morehead State University
Program Committee	Richard J. Elliott University of New Orleans
	Carol S. Stack University of New Orleans

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

44th Annual Meeting
Texas Educational Foundations Society

Thursday morning, September 23, 1993
Iberville Room

9:00-10:00am Business Meeting

10:15-11:30am

Seventh Annual William E. Drake Lecture

INTRODUCTION

Martha Tevis
University of Texas -- Pan American

DRAKE LECTURE

"Was Bill Drake a Religious Person?"

Bill Fisher
University of Montana

Moderator: Paul Wagner
University of Houston -- Clear Lake

11:30-5:00pm REGISTRATION
New Orleans West

LUNCH -- OYO

Thursday afternoon, September 23, 1993
SESSION IA
Iberville Room
Presider: Sam Stack

1:00-1:30pm "Inferences From Studies About the Contradictory Role of Adult Education in the University"

Henry R. Weinstock
University of Missouri -- St. Louis

1:35--2:05pm "Critical Pedagogy, Liberalism and Dewey"

David Snelgrove
Oklahoma City Schools

2:10-2:40pm "The Privatization of Schools and the General Welfare"

Richard J. Elliott, Carol S. Stack
University of New Orleans

2:45-3:15pm "Character Education, Values Education, and Equity Education: A New Dilemma or Old?"

Fred Kierstead
University of Houston -- Clear Lake

3:15-3:30pm BREAK

Thursday afternoon, September 23, 1993
SESSION IB
New Orleans West
Presider: Bill Cowart

1:00-1:30pm OPEN

1:35--2:05pm "The Junkyard Dog"

Stanley D. Ivie
Texas Woman's University

2:10-2:40pm "Derrida, Can You Spare a Paradigm? Deconstructive Architecture as the Great Broken Mirror"

Allen Ketcham
Texas A & I University

2:45-3:15pm "Reconstruction and Deconstruction: Implications of Contemporary Critical Theory"

James D. Swartz
University of Arkansas -- Fayetteville

3:15-3:30pm BREAK

Thursday afternoon, September 23, 1993
SESSION IIA
Iberville Room
Presider: Mary Lou Aylor

3:30-4:00pm "Derrida, Deconstruction and Education Policy Analysis"

Charles J. Fazzaro
University of Missouri -- St. Louis

4:05-4:35pm "What We Must Learn and Unlearn About Language"

Mario Benitez
University of Texas -- Austin

4:40-5:10pm "Thomas Jefferson after 250 Years"

Jed Arthur Cooper
University of North Texas

5:15-6:15pm PANEL DISCUSSION

"Paradigm Shifts in Academe"
New Orleans West
Presider: Wayne Willis

"Educational Reform Reports: Fads or Commitments"
James Van Patten and James Bolding
University of Arkansas -- Fayetteville

"Truth is Irrelevant in the One-Room School"
James Bolding
University of Arkansas -- Fayetteville

Thursday afternoon, September 23, 1993
SESSION IIB
New Orleans West
Presider: Charles Davidson

3:30-4:00pm "Doublespeak and Euphemisms in Education"

Jerry Pulley
University of Texas -- Pan American

4:05-4:35pm "Deferral of Gratification, Mind and Character"

Louis Goldman
Wichita State University

4:40-5:10pm "Pragmatic Conceptions of Community"

Sam Stack
West Virginia University

5:15-6:15pm PANEL DISCUSSION

"Paradigm Shifts in Academe"
New Orleans West
Presider: Wayne Willis

"Ignorance Revisited:
Whatever Happened to Current Events"
Bob Reilly
University of Arkansas -- Fayetteville

"International Partnerships in Education"
Margaret Clark and Annette Digby
University of Arkansas -- Fayetteville

Friday morning, September 24, 1993
SESSION IIIA
Iberville Room
Presider: Mario Benitez

8:30-12:00am REGISTRATION

8:30-9:00am "Belief Systems of Arkansas Public Schools Superintendents"

Ann E. Witcher
Chicago State University

9:05-9:35am "George Peabody's (1795-1869) Educational Legacy! Bicentennial View"

Franklin Parker
Betty J. Parker
Western Carolina University

9:40-10:10am "Education for Democracy in East Germany Today"

James E. McClellan
Dorothy Spektorov McClellan
Texas A & M University -- Corpus Christi

10:10-10:25am BREAK

Friday morning, September 24, 1993
SESSION IIIB
New Orleans West
Presider: Jed Arthur Cooper

8:30-12:00am REGISTRATION

8:30-9:00am "May I Speak?: A Reflective Recovery of Student Voice"

Katherine M. Benson
Springhill High School -- Springhill, LA

9:05-9:35am "Philosophical Basis of Social Sciences"

Paul Wagner
University of Houston -- Clear Lake

9:40-10:10am "It's All In The Way We Look At Things -- Is It?"

William Vanderhoff
Cornell Thomas
Texas Christian University

10:10-10:25am BREAK

Friday morning, September 24, 1993
SESSION IVA
Iberville Room
Presider: Richard Elliott

10:25-10:55am "Men's Roles in Women's Studies: A Case in Point"

Joe L. Green
Louisiana State University -- Shreveport

11:00-11:30am "Defining the "We": The Problem of Ethnicity and Multicultural Education"

Dalton B. Curtis, Jr.
Southeast Missouri State University -- Cape Girardeau

11:35-12:05pm "Somewhat Less Than Perfect: Carl Schurz's Policies and the Indian Schools"

Karen McKellips
Cameron University

12:30-2:30pm

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS and LUNCHEON
New Orleans East

"The Educational Reform in Kentucky or How to Build the Plane After You're Off the Ground"

Wayne Willis
Morehead State University

2:30-3:15 ANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING
New Orleans East

Wayne Willis
1993 SWPES President
Morehead State University

Friday morning, September 24, 1993
SESSION IVB
New Orleans West
Presider: Edward Cullum

10:25-10:55am "Academic Integrity in the Soviet World! A Biography of Ilho Korunets, Educator and Iconoclast"

Cliff Schimmels
Lee College

11:00-11:30am "The Future of Philosophy of Education Courses"

Joe Cornett
Texas Tech University

11:35-12:05pm "The Down Side of International Education"

Gene Thibadeau
Indiana University -- Pennsylvania

12:30-2:30pm

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS and LUNCHEON
New Orleans East

"The Educational Reform in Kentucky or How to Build the Plane After You're Off the Ground"

Wayne Willis
Morehead State University

2:30-3:15 ANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING
New Orleans East

Wayne Willis
1993 SWPES President
Morehead State University

Friday afternoon, September 24, 1993
SESSION VA
Iberville Room
Presider: Charles Fazzaro

3:30-4:00pm "A Critique of Chiu Chin: A Radical Chinese Feminist and National Revolutionary"

Timothy Bergen, Jr.
University of South Carolina

4:05-4:35pm "New Theoretical Perspectives on Educational Organizations"

Spencer Maxcy
Louisiana State University -- Baton Rouge

4:40-5:10pm "Odious Comparison, Part II: Here and There"

Edward Cullum
Tennessee State University

5:10-5:20pm BREAK

5:20-6:20pm PANEL DISCUSSION

"African-American Teachers in the South"
New Orleans West
Presider: Dalton Curtis

"Historical Images of African-American Teachers"
Clinton B. Allison
University of Tennesse -- Knoxville

"The 60-40 Decision of the Chatanooga Public Schools: How Racial Quotas Affected African-American Teachers"
Thomas K. Jones
University of Tennessee -- Chatanooga

Friday afternoon, September 24, 1993
SESSION VB
New Orleans West
Presider: Deron Boyles

3:30-4:00pm "Paulo Freire and Religious Education"

John M. Townsend
University of Arkansas -- Fayetteville

4:05-4:35pm "The Educational Thoughts of Mao Zedong from 1949 to 1976"

Hanfu Mi
Georgia Southwestern College

4:40-5:10pm "Major Paradigm Shifts in the Educational Reform Movement in Oregon"

Bill Cowart
Western Oregon State College

5:10-5:20pm BREAK

5:20-6:20pm PANEL DISCUSSION

"African-American Teachers in the South"
New Orleans West
Presider: Dalton Curtis

"African-American Teachers' Perceptions of Failure"
Eleanor Blair-Hilty
Western Carolina University

"Subjected Knowledges: Rethinking Modern Epistemology"
Joe Kinchloe
Florida International University

Saturday morning, September 25, 1993

SESSION VIA

Iberville Room

Presider: Franklin Parker

8:30-9:00am "The Professional Development School: Prescriptions and Proscriptions"

Douglas J. Simpson
Texas Christian University

9:05-9:35am "Teacher Evaluation: An Exercise in Phoniness"

Charles W. Davidson
University of Southern Mississippi

9:40-10:10am "When Undergraduates Speak, Who's Talking?"

Deron R. Boyles
Georgia State University

10:15-10:45am "Revisiting Traditional Components of International Education"

Jerman Disasa
University of South Carolina
Columbia

10:50-11:20am "The Hedge Schools and Education in the American South"

Earl Jost
University of Tennessee - Knoxville

11:25-11:55am "Susan Blow and the St. Louis City Schools"

Paul Travers
University of Missouri - St. Louis

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Saturday morning, September 25, 1993

SESSION VIB

New Orleans West

Presider: Karen McKellips

8:30-9:00am "Kenneth D. Benne in Retrospect"

Bill Fisher
University of Montana

9:05-9:35am "The Big Bang You Just Heard Was the Explosion of the Teacher Shortage Hoax"

William F. Ferguson
University of Southern Mississippi

9:40-10:10am "The New 3R's in America's Schools: Restrict, Reserve, Reject!"

Mary Lou Aylor
Central Michigan University

George Mann
East Central University

10:15-10:45am "Effective Education for African-American Students: A Cultural Model"

Bartley L. McSwine
Chicago State University

10:50-11:20am "The Role of Teachers in the Dysfunctional Socialization of Selected Cases of Adjudicated Delinquent Females"

Layla Sabie
Morehead State University

SOCIETY FOR EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY AND HISTORY
OFFICIAL MEMBERSHIP LIST
FALL 1993

Clinton Allison
College of Education
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN 37916
(615) 577-2607

Teryl Anderson
Division of Education
University of Texas
Odessa, TX 79762

Mary Williams Aylor
224 Ronan Hall
Central Michigan University
Mt. Pleasant, MI 48859
(517) 774-3136

Mario Benitez
Department of Curriculum
University of Texas
Austin, TX 78712

Kathryn M. Benson
P.O. Box 653
Cullen, LA 71021
(318) 994-2513

Tim Bergen
College of Education
University of South Carolina
Columbia, SC 29208
(803) 777-5230

Hugh Black
934 K. Street
Davis, CA 95616

Eleanor Blair-Hilty
School of Education
Western Carolina University
Cullowee, NC 28723

James Bolding
Graduate Education
University of Arkansas
Fayetteville, AR 72701

Mike Boone
College of Education
South West Texas State University
San Marcos, TX 78666-4616
(512) 245-3759

Jim R. Bowman
College of Education
University of Central Arkansas
Conway, AR 72032

Margaret Clark
Graduate Education
University of Arkansas
Fayetteville, AR 72701

Deron Boyles
School of Education
Georgia State University
Atlanta GA 30303
(404) 433-9997

J. Arthur Cooper
College of Education
University of North Texas
Denton, TX 76023
(817) 464-7424

Joe Cornett
College of Education
Texas Tech University
Lubbock, TX 79409
(806) 742-2393

Billy Cowart
Western Oregon College
Monmouth, OR 97361

Ed Cullum
College of Education
Tennessee State University
Nashville, TN 37204
(615) 297-4276

Dalton B. Curtis, Jr.
Department of Educational
Administration & Counseling
South West Missouri St. University
Cape Girardeau, MO 63701

Annette Digby
Graduate Education
University of Arkansas
Fayetteville, AR 72701

Charles Davidson
College of Education
University of Southern Mississippi
Hattiesburg, MS 34406
(601) 266-4583

Jerman Disasa
College of Education
University of South Carolina
Columbia, SC 29208
(803) 777-3094

Richard J. Elliott
College of Education
University of New Orleans
New Orleans, LA 70122
(504) 286-6448

Charles Fazzaro
School of Education
University of Missours-St. Louis
St. Louis, MO 63121
(314) 533-5944

William F. Ferguson
College of Education
University of Southern Mississippi
Hattiesburg, MS 39406
(601) 266-4566

William Fisher
College of Education
University of Montana
Missoula, MT 59801

Ruth Galaz
Division of Education
University of Texas
San Antonio, TX 78285

Louis Goldman
Box 28
Wichita State University
Wichita, KS 67205
(316) 689-3322

Joe Green
9412 Shartel Drive
Shreveport, LA 71118
(318) 678-1124

Kenneth H. Hansen
Spring Creek Rd.
Almont, CO 81210
(303) 641-0132

Stan Ivie
Dept. of Educational Foundations
Texas Woman's University
Denton, TX 76024
(817) 898-2238

Thomas Jones
University of Tennessee
Chatanooga, TN 37403

Allan Ketcham
Box 187
Texas A & I University
Campus Box 211
Kingsville, TX 78363
(512) 595-2148

Fred D. Kierstead, Jr.
School of Education
U. of Houston-Clear Lake
Houston, TX 77058
(713) 488-9405

Joseph Kincheloe
College of Education
Florida International University
Miami, FL 33199

Jessica K. Latshaw
College of Education
University of Saskatchewan
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan
(303) 373-1513

Alex Lotas
Texas A & M University
Corpus Christi, TX 78412
(512) 994-2309

George Mann
West Texas State Univ.
Canyon, TX 79015

Spencer Maxcy
College of Education
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, LA 70803

Jim E. McClellan
Texas A&M University
6300 Ocean Drive
Corpus Christi, TX 78412
(512) 994-2202

Karen McKellips
Department of Education
Cameron University
Lawton, OK 73505
(405) 248-8638

Bartley McSwine
Secondary Education
Chicago State University
Chicago, IL 60628

Han-fu Mi
Department of Education
Georgia Southwestern University
Americas, GA 31709

Franklin Parker
School of Education & Psychology
Western Carolina University
Cullowhee, NC 29723
(704) 293-3013

Jerry Pulley
School of Education
University of Texas-Pan American
Edinburg, TX 78539

John Pulliam
College of Education
University of Montana
Missoula, MT 59812

Ronald Reed
School of Education
Texas Wesleyan University
Fort Worth, TX 76105
(817) 457-4595

Robert Reilly
Graduate Education
University of Arkansas
Fayetteville, AR 72701
(501) 575-5109

Cliff Schimmels
Lee College
Cleveland, TN 37311

Douglas Simpson
School of Education
Texas Christian University
Forth Worth, TX 76129

David Snelgrove
4520 Zella Way NE
Piedmont, OK 73078
(405) 373-0300

Carol Stack
College of Education
University of New Orleans Lakefront
New Orleans, LA 70148
(504) 286-6448

Sam Stack
College of Human Resources & Education
West Virginia University
Morgantown WV 26506
(304) 293-2515

Chipman Stuart
College of Education
University of Oklahoma
Norman, OK 73019

James D. Swartz
Graduate Education
University of Arkansas
Fayetteville, AR 72701
(501) 756-8715

Barbara J. Taylor
2216 W. 5th Street
Stillwater, OK 74074
(405) 743-4497

Michael R. Taylor
Oklahoma State University
226 Hanner Hall
Stillwater, OK
(405) 744-6088

Martha Tevis
School of Education
University of Texas-Pan American
Edinburg, TX 78539
(512) 383-7022

Gene Thibadeau
Rd. 1, Box 103
Penn Run, PA 15765
(412) 349-4680

Cornell Thomas
Texas Christian University
Ft. Worth, TX 76129
(817) 921-7943

John Townsend
Graduate Education
University of Arkansas
Fayetteville, AR 72701
(501) 575-6754

Paul Travers
School of Education
University of Missouri-St. Louis
St. Louis, MO 63121
(314) 291-3421

Bill Vanderhoof
School of Education
Texas Christian University
Fort Worth, TX 76129
(817) 921-7943

James Van Patten
Graduate Education
University of Arkansas
Fayetteville, AR 72701

James Wagener
Division of Education
University of Texas-San Antonio
San Antonio, TX 78249
(512) 691-5641

Paul Wagner
School of Education
University of Houston-Clear Lake
Houston, TX 77057-1098
(713) 283-3571

Henry Weinstock
School of Education
University of Missouri-St. Louis
St. Louis, MO 63121

Wayne Willis
School of Education
Morehead State University
Morehead, KY 40351

Ann E. Witcher
College of Education
University of Central Arkansas
Conway, AR 72035
(501) 450-3174

Donna Lee Younker
University of Central Oklahoma
Edmond, OK 73034
(405) 341-4889

John Zepper
College of Education
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, NM 87111